

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October, the last issue being a double number; the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

R. HACKFORTH, M.A., Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.
J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., Hertford College, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. E. S. GONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.
Prof. A. O. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.
L. WHIBLEY, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(*Hon. Treasurer.*)

With the Chairman, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XXV.

JULY-OCTOBER, 1931

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
STUDIES IN THE STRUCTURE OF ATTIC SOCIETY: I. DEMOTIONIDAI	
H. T. WADE-GERY	129
PUGILUM GLORIA (Ter. Hec. 33)	W. M. LINDSAY 144
MISCELLANEA—VIII.	T. W. ALLEN 146
TERENCE QUOTATIONS IN SERVIUS AUCTUS	J. D. CRAIG 151
IOLAOS AND THE NINTH PYTHIAN ODE	H. J. ROSE 156
NOTE BY DR. L. R. FARNELL	162
MORE LIVY NOT IN THE LEXICA	G. B. A. FLETCHER 165
THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE ORPHIC ARGONAUTICA	J. R. BACON 172
HOMODYNE IN THE FOURTH FOOT OF THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER	
W. F. J. KNIGHT	184
THE HELLENISM OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA	R. E. WITT 195
THE FOX AND THE GRAPES	A. D. KNOX 205
PROSE RHYTHM AND THE COMPARATIVE METHOD	H. RACKHAM 211
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS: LITERATURE AND GENERAL	212
LANGUAGE	219
INDICES	221

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET

Price for single numbers, 4/- net, or 4/2 post free. Yearly Subscription 16/- post free; U.S.A. \$4.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25/- post free; U.S.A. \$6.25

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries, (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; inquiries to the Hon. Secretaries, Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury, c/o The Triangle Secretarial Offices, 61, South Molton St., London, W. 1; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, M.A., University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, M.A., University College, Bangor; Dr. G. H. Goldsmith, 6, Bromham Road, Bedford; Mr. G. A. Auden, M.D., M.A., F.R.C.P., F.S.A., 42, Lordwood Road, Harborne, Birmingham; Mr. H. Pitman, The University, Bristol; Mr. W. H. S. Jones, Litt.D., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, M.A., Fernshaw, Lake Road West, Cardiff; Mr. M. M. Gillies, Ph.D., University College, Hull; Miss M. M. Towne, County School for Girls, Beckenham, Kent; Mr. D. E. F. Binyon, The University, Leeds; Mr. D. L. Hewitt, B.A., Wyggeston School for Boys, Leicester; Mr. G. B. A. Fletcher, B.A., The University, Liverpool; Miss W. A. Greatbatch, 150, Park Road, London, W. 4; Mr. E. J. Wood, B.A., The University, Manchester; Miss I. Jenkin, 8, Sandhurst Avenue, Withington, Manchester; Mr. B. Anderton, M.A., Public Library, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Professor F. S. Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. T. B. L. Webster, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford; Miss C. Keith, St. Hilda's College, Oxford; Miss N. C. Jolliffe, The University, Reading; Mr. G. H. P. P. Tredennick, M.A., 28, Beech Hill Road, Sheffield; Mrs. F. G. Maunsell, B.A., 66, Ethelbert Avenue, Southampton; Professor F. Fletcher, M.A., University College, Exeter (South-Western Branch); Mr. F. P. B. Shipham, 48, Rutland Gardens, Hove, Sussex; Mr. H. Hill, M.A., University College of Swansea; Mr. A. M. Moore, H.M.I., Byam's, Fitzhead, Taunton; Mr. R. Dobbin, 326, Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand.

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscape 8vo, 400–600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net.
Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

NEW BOOKS READY, 1931
(End of October)

Latin

253. *Ovid Fasti*. Translated by SIR J. G. FRAZER.

Greek

256. *Philostratus: Imagines and Callistratus: Descriptions*. Translated by A. FAIRBANKS. (Illustrated.)

258. *Greek Elegy and Iambus (Callinus to Crates, excepting the Choliambic writers),*

259. *with the Anacreontea*. Translated by J. M. EDMONDS. Two vols.

Each volume, F'cap 8vo, 400–600 pages. Cloth, 10s. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library)
FREE together with Descriptive Prospectus, etc.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

d
on
al
to
te

al
s.
gs
al
al
re
st

se,
M.
the
ity
H.
42,
S.
w,
M.
ty,
er,
Mr.
on,
S.
d ;
fr.
56,
th-
ill,
on ;

e
,

s.

),

TI

STU

IN
I was
'Aθ. π
sought
more p

(a

(b

So
and the
fictions
origins
(I beli
origin
never h
of a so
Genos
part.
all atte
the wo

Pr
no cruc
anythin
later.
Eupatr
access
honour
Kingsh
and con
social
obsoles

¹ C. Q.

² Quot

NOS.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY-OCTOBER, 1931.

STUDIES IN THE STRUCTURE OF ATTIC SOCIETY: I. DEMOTIONIDAI.

IN an earlier paper on this topic, 'Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus,'¹ I was primarily concerned to recover the views of Aristotle, as expressed in the 'Αθ. πολ., on such elements of Attic Society as Eupatridai, Gennetai, etc. I sought to establish that to him at least these two were not identical: that, more precisely, he recorded two stages of development—

- (a) 'Ion': in whose day the whole body of Athenians was composed of *Gennetai*, while *Eupatridai* had not yet been created.
- (b) 'Theseus': who created the Eupatridai—distinguishing them, as a Third Estate, from those two Estates (*Georgoi* and *Demiourgoi*) which had hitherto, since Ion, composed the body of Athenians.

Some few scholars perhaps will regard Ion and Theseus as real people, and these two stages as historic facts. Personally, I cannot: I regard them as fictions, and Aristotle's two stages as a schematic and fictional account of the origins of the Society he knew. But at least one conclusion as to fact may (I believe) be drawn from his fiction—viz. *Eupatridai* and *Gennetai*, of whose origin he gives such different accounts, were not identical bodies. This should never have been in doubt, since we are told (by Polemon only:² yet it is a fact of a sort which it is scarcely permissible to doubt) that the *Gennetai* of the Genos Hesychidai performed a certain sacrifice in which no *Eupatridai* took part. Yet the contrary view, held tacitly or explicitly, has been an axiom in all attempts to diagnose the structure of Attic Society: and a double sense of the word 'Eupatridai' has been posited, which I trust I have proved untrue.³

Proceeding further from Aristotle's fiction to historic fact, I think there is no crucial difficulty about the Eupatridai. It is questionable indeed what, if anything, we may infer from their alleged Thesean origin: I will deal with this later. But I am content to accept Aristotle's view as historic, that the Eupatrid Order was, before Solon, a nobility of birth with a monopoly of access to high office. Indeed I go further, and imagine that the fountain of honour had been the King, and the Eupatrid Order had been created by the Kingship: that for about a century at least (by 594) there had been no King, and consequently the Order had been closed throughout that period of violent social change: that this was one of the reasons why Solon abolished their obsolescent monopoly. However that may be, a 'Eupatrid' after Solon is easy

¹ C. Q. XXV. (1931), pp. 1 sqq., 77 sqq.

² C. Q. XXV., pp. 83-85.

³ Quoted by the scholiast on Soph. O.C. 489.

enough to define: he is a descendant in male line of one of those families which had once held a monopoly of all high office, and still retained the monopoly of certain archaic offices (the Phyllobasileis and the Eupatrid Exegetai). Nor is their relation obscure to the rest of the body of Athenians as a whole. The Eupatridai had never composed the whole nation: they had been selected out of the nation, and during their monopoly the body of remaining Athenians not eligible for high office had always existed.

The relation of the Eupatridai to the *Genê* and that of the Gennetai to the body of Athenians are not nearly so simple questions. I am not at all prepared to take for granted Aristotle's theory that Gennetai had once composed the whole nation:¹ nor, consequently, that Francotte's question, 'How did the non-Gennetai become part of the nation?' is a *vera quaestio*. Equally incapable of an immediate *a priori* answer is the difficult and important question, 'Does Eupatrid-hood extend to a whole Genos?'—e.g. Kallias is a Eupatrid (Xen. *Symp.* 8. 40) and member of the Genos *Kerykes* (Andoc. *Myst.* 116): does it follow that all members of the Genos *Kerykes* are Eupatrids? It is not even self-evident that the Eupatrid families are all necessarily Gennetai: by Aristotle's fiction (that a Eupatrid is *ἰθαγενής* as far as Theseus, but a Gennete is *ἰθαγενής* as far as Ion) Eupatrid-hood does not *eo ipso* carry Gennete-hood.

Now it is evident that progressive statesmen, from Solon onwards, were concerned to limit the prerogatives and influence of birth: and that, notwithstanding, certain qualifications of blood were still respected, as late as the fourth century. To understand both the progressive statesmen's task and the power of survival which birth-privilege possessed, it is essential to define these qualifications of blood as exactly as we can. The studies which follow are intended as contributions to this enquiry. That it is not yet time to systematize is evident if I am right in thinking that previous theory has rested on false axioms.

[I treat the terms 'body of Athenians,' 'Athenian nation,' 'citizen body' as convertible. In the territory of Athens there may be aliens resident (*μέτοικοι*), whether free (*ξένοι*) or slaves (*δοῦλοι*): there may be people on her borders who are under her sovereignty (*περίοικοι*): all these are no part of the nation. All others are, and are Athenian citizens. The extent of their citizen rights may vary to an indefinite extent, and women and children are of course in special categories: but I believe that never in Greece (until the doctrinaire reaction against democracy in the second half of the fifth century) is the theory held that any native adult male in a sovran community has *no concern at all*² in the conduct of affairs: I therefore call him a citizen.]

¹ As little as I am prepared, *a priori*, to deny it.

² The *ὑπομειλόμενοι* at Sparta are in this position, but we do not hear of them before 400 B.C. The *ἄμειλοι* were defined c. 600 B.C. (*C.A.H.* III. 562) and it may be said that the notion of *ἄμειλοι* implies the notion of *ὑπομειλόμενοι*. If that were so, I would have to date as early as 600 those pre-

cautions against a power-hungry Demos which I think in fact were first taken about 450 (e.g. in Boeotia, if the arrangements in *Hell. Ox.* XI. date from the Battle of Koroneia). I do not in any case believe that the *Thetes* in Athens were made *ὑπομειλόμενοι* ever, except under the 400, and the 30, and in the Macedonian period.

§
Phratr
the civ
memb
connex
there.
Dekele
T
import
will re
has thi
are by
Attic p
vision
I
referen
decree,
is is fra

¹ The
is Hiller
accepts i
the posi
witz *Ar*
forty yea
sion. A
Swoboda
959 sqq.
works th
Genealogi

I. THE SO-CALLED 'DEMOTIONID DECREES,' I.G. II². 1237.¹

§ 1. These decrees are resolutions of the Phratry of Dekeleia. This Phratry is, in effect, the 'ecclesiastical parish,' the 'Deme of Dekeleia' being the civil parish. The 'congregation' was hereditary and may have included members scattered all over the map of Attica; yet it had at least this especial connexion with Dekeleia, that the sanctuary and altar of Zeus Phratrios were there. Moreover the Phratry's name was, I believe, Dekeleieis (Δεκελειῶν, the Dekeleians): I will come back to this question.

The resolutions of these ecclesiastical parishes are not ordinarily of the first importance. Yet there is a certain interest in seeing how occupied territory will revert to the normal, and Dekeleia in 396 B.C. (the date of the first decree) has this special claim on our notice. Moreover the 126 lines of this inscription are by far the most substantial document which we possess concerning the Attic phratrīai; and inexact notions on this topic spoil the clearness of our vision of mature Athens, and for archaic Athens blind us almost completely.

I give, first, a translation of the two decrees: keeping (for convenience of reference) as close as possible to the lines of the Greek. I omit the third decree, that of Menexenos. It is later in date: it is incomplete, and what there is is fragmentary:² it may also be fairly called less important.

[Stele?] of Zeus Phratrios.

Priest, Theodoros son of Euphantides,
inscribed and erected the stele.

They shall give the priest priestly dues

- 5 as follows; from the Meion³ a thigh, a rib, an ear,
3 obols of money; from the Koureion³ a thigh,
a rib, an ear, a cake weighing 1 choinix,
a ½-chous of wine, a drachma of money.

Resolved as follows by the Phrateres, when

- 10 Phormion was Archon at Athens 396/5
and the Phratriarch was Pantakles
of Oion.

HIEROKLES MOVED: Whoever have not yet been
scrutinized according to the Nomos of the Demotionidai,

- 15 the Phrateres shall make scrutiny of them
forthwith, after swearing by

¹ The most recent text, with full commentary, is Hiller von Gaertringen's in *Sylloge*³ 921. Hiller accepts *in toto* (one slight disagreement in note 35) the position brilliantly established by Wilamowitz *Arist. und Athen* 260 sqq. This, though forty years old, is still the fundamental discussion. Add to the references in *Sylloge*³ Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatkunde*, pp. 879 and 959 sqq., especially 962 and note 2, and further works there quoted: also Toepffer, *Attische Genealogie*, pp. 289-291, and Szanto, *Rh. Mus.* 40

(1885), pp. 506 sqq., the latest writer (I believe) to distinguish the Demotionidai from the Phratry.

² The restorations in the corresponding part of the front face are reasonably certain (50-58).

³ *Meion* and *Koureion* correspond roughly to Baptism and Confirmation: they are the Sacrifices offered, on behalf of an aspirant member, at infancy and coming of age. This is indeed not more than a hypothesis, since the main text, Pollux VIII. 107, is quite indecisive. See Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatkunde*, p. 961.

- Zeus Phratrios, carrying their votes from the altar. Whosoever seems, not being a Phrater, to have been introduced, his name shall be expunged by the
- 20 Priest and the Phratriarch from the list which is in [the archives] of the Demotionidai and from the copy. He who introduced the man expelled on scrutiny must pay 100 drachmai, dedicate to Zeus Phratrios: the money shall be collected
- 25 by the Priest and the Phratriarch or they themselves must pay it. The scrutiny shall in future be in the year following that in which (the Phratriarch) sacrifices the Koureion, on the Koureotis day of Apatouria, and they shall carry the votes from the altar.
- 30 If any one wishes to appeal to the Demotionidai after an adverse vote, he may: Synegoroi shall be chosen to sit with them¹ by the Dekeleia Lodge, 5 men not less than 30 years old. They shall be
- 35 sworn, by the Phratriarch and the Priest, to exercise their function with all justice, and not to let any man who is not a Phrater be in the Phratry. Any appellant who gets an adverse vote from the Demotionidai must pay 1,000 drachmai
- 40 dedicate to Zeus Phratrios: this money shall be collected by the Priest of the Dekeleia Lodge, or he must pay it himself: and any other of the Phrateres who chooses may collect it, for the common treasury. The above
- 45 to hold good from the Archonship of Phormion. 396/5 The Phratriarch shall put the vote concerning those who are due for scrutiny in the course of each year: if he fail to put the vote, he must pay 500 drachmai dedicate to Zeus
- 50 Phratrios, and the Priest shall collect this money, or any other who chooses, for the common treasury. In future, they shall bring *Meion* and *Koureion* offerings to Dekeleia to the altar, and if (the Phratriarch) fails to sacrifice them on the altar,
- 55 he must pay 50 (?) drachmai dedicate to Zeus Phratrios, and the Priest shall collect
- 57 this money or himself must pay it.

[At least one line missing, probably to this effect: 'That is to say, unless there is war or pestilence.']

¹ *en avrois*, lit. 'in addition to them.' Sc. the Demotionidai.

- 59 In the event of such a hindrance, wherever the
 60 Priest shall notify, the *Meion*
 and *Koureion* offerings shall be brought there. He shall give notice
 5 days before Dorpia¹ on a white notice board
 at least 1 span across, wherever is
 the resort of Dekeleieis in Athens. This
 65 decree and the priestly dues shall be
 inscribed by the Priest on a marble stele
 in front of the altar at Dekeleia, at his
 own expense. NIKODEMOS MOVED: To concur
 in the former decrees laid down concerning the
 70 introduction of sons and their
 scrutiny: *but* the 3 witnesses mentioned
 for the Anakrisis² must be found amongst (the father's)
 own Thiasotai, to give evidence on the questions asked
 and to take the oath by Zeus Phratrios.
 75 The witnesses shall give evidence and take the oath
 with their hand on the altar. If there are not,
 in that Thiasos, so many as 3, they
 shall be found amongst the other Phrateres. When
 the scrutiny takes place, the Phratriarch shall not
 80 put the vote concerning the sons
 to the whole body of Phrateres until
 the introducer's Thiasotai vote in secret
 carrying their votes from the altar.
 Their votes shall be counted,
 85 in sight of the whole body of Phrateres present
 at the meeting, by the Phratriarch,
 and he shall declare which way they
 have voted. If, when the Thiasotai have voted
 that he is a Phrater, the other
 90 Phrateres give an adverse vote, the Thiasotai
 must pay 100 drachmai dedicate to Zeus
 Phratrios, except such of the Thiasotai
 as publicly denounce or oppose (the candidate)
 during the scrutiny. If the
 95 Thiasotai give an adverse vote, and the introducer
 appeals to the whole body, and the whole body
 holds that (his candidate) is a Phrater, his name shall be entered
 in the common lists: but if the whole body
 gives an adverse vote, he must pay 100 drachmai

¹ The first day of Apatouria (so e.g. Hesychius and Suidas, s.v. Ἀπαυρούρια: other late writers say the second day, but see note 31 to *Sylloge*² 921).

² A preliminary enquiry, such as the Archon held before cases came into court. The previous decree in which these three witnesses were mentioned is not now extant.

- 100 dedicate to Zeus Phratríos. If,
after the Thiasotai's adverse vote, he does not appeal
to the whole body, the adverse vote
of the Thiasotai shall stand. The Thiasotai
shall not vote with the whole body
- 105 on the sons belonging to their own
Thiasos. The Priest shall inscribe
this decree as well on the marble
stele. The oath of the witnesses at the introduction
of sons: *I testify that he whom he is introducing*
- 110 *is his own son born in wedlock from his lawful*
wife. This is the truth, by Zeus Phratríos:
many blessings on me if my oath is good;
if I forswear myself, the contrary.

These are resolutions of the Phratry. Theodoros the Priest is priest of the Phratry, and as such receives the fees which the members pay at the two sacrifices involved in the introduction of a new member. The Phratriarch Pantakles is, of course, Phratriarch of the Phratry.

'The priest' and 'the phratriarch' referred to in the remainder of the document are, presumably, Theodoros and Pantakles or their successors. For the phratriarch, this is beyond doubt: but as to the priest, doubts can evidently be entertained, for Toepffer concludes his account of the Dekeleieis in his *Attische Genealogie*, p. 291, with the words, 'whether the priest mentioned in line 60 is the priest of the Genos (Dekeleieis) or the Phratry (Demotionidai) cannot be decided.' I will examine the instances.

Theodoros the priest combines with his priestly function that of a *Grammateus*, or secretary: this stele is erected by him (2/3, 66) at his own cost (67/8), and consequently his name stands, as that of a *Grammateus* in State decrees often stands, at the head of the stele. It is beyond question, then, that the priest in 2, 66, and 107, is the same priest—Theodoros or his successor. Further secretarial duties are—to post the notice in case the sacrifice cannot be held at Dekeleia (60), and to expunge the name of anyone refused on scrutiny (19/20): the phratriarch shares this last responsibility. [The inscribing ordered in 97/8 is probably done by the same two, but this is not stated.] In 2, 66, 107, 60, and 19/20, then, we have the priest of the Phratry, Theodoros or his successor.

The remaining duties of 'the priest' are—

1. He is, in company with the phratriarch, to administer the oath to the
5 *Synegoroi* appointed to represent the Dekeleieis when appeal is
made to the Demotionidai (32 sqq., especially 35):
2. He is to collect certain fines, viz.:
 - (a) (in company with the phratriarch) 100 drachmas from the
introducer of a man refused on scrutiny (25):

- (b) 1,000 drachmas from a man who appeals unsuccessfully to the Demotionidai (41/2: he is here called ο ιερειος το Δεκελειων οικου, 'the Priest of the Dekeleia Lodge):
- (c) 500 drachmas from the phratriarch, if he fail to put any name to the scrutiny (50):
- (d) 50 drachmas (? the figure is mostly missing) from the phratriarch, if he fail to sacrifice on the altar at Dekeleia (55).

It seems to me most unlikely that 'the priest' in any of these cases is any other than Theodoros (or his successor), the priest of the Phratry; who, as we see, is also secretary and treasurer. In 2 (b) he is called 'the priest of the Dekeleia Lodge,' and in 1 he administers the oath to men chosen by the Dekeleia Lodge.

I take it, then, that 'the Dekeleia Lodge' (ο των Δεκελειων οικος) is the name of the Phratry: or, more simply, Δεκελειησ.¹ This is why the priest has to post his notice at the 'Rendezvous in Athens of the Δεκελειησ'² (64, cf. 122/3).

Some forty years ago³ Wilamowitz strenuously denied this, asserting that the name of the Phratry is *Demotionidai*: and his view has found, I believe, absolute acceptance. It is universally held that the Phratry is *Demotionidai*, and the *Dekeleieis* are not the Phratry but some portion of it. What, then, can we make of Theodoros, priest of the Dekeleieis and, apparently, priest of the Phratry? Wilamowitz indeed holds that the 'priest of the House of Dekeleieis' is, *ex officio*, priest of the Phratry: but this solution has not satisfied everyone. It is indeed worse to assume that two priests are in question: yet

¹ Their Eponym is Dekelos, who helped the Tyndaridai to find Helen at Aphidna, Hdt. IX. 73. 2. Herodotus there says of Sophanes that he was εκ δήμου Δεκελειθεν, Δεκελειων δὲ τῶν κοτε εργασαμένων ἔργον χρήσιμον, etc. [the story of Dekelos]: i.e. (I think) Sophanes belonged to both *Deme* and *Phratry* of Dekeleia. The same distinction appears to be made by Lysias XXIII. 2-3. Pankleon (in Lysias' story) claimed to be a Plataean, and to have been inscribed in the Deme of Dekeleia, Δεκελειθεν: the speaker therefore went to the barber's shop by the Hermai, ἵνα οἱ Δεκελειεῖς προσφοιτῶσιν, to enquire: οὗς τε ἐξευρίσκομι Δεκελειῶν ἐπυνθανόμην εἰ τινα γινώσκουσιν Δεκελειθεν δημοτευμένον Παγκλέωνα. It was the Rendezvous of the *Phratry* (Δεκελειεῖς), but they would be more likely than any other group in Athens to know about members of the Deme (Δεκελειθεν δημοτευμένοι).—Except in these two passages (where they are being distinguished from the Phrateres) Demesmen of Dekeleia are always, I believe, called Δεκελειεῖς (Δεκελειῆς, Δεκελεῖς, etc.).—See Appendix, ΔΕΚΕΛΕΙΕΙΣ.

² This is not a fixed Rendezvous (ἅπλοι ἂν προσφοιτῶσιν): but the Phrateres would always have some favourite resort. At about this

moment it was a barber's shop near the Hermai, in the Agora; see preceding note, and Lysias 23. 3, of about this date.—Domaszewski, *Die Hermen der Agora zu Athen* (Sitzb. Heidelberg, 1914, Abh. 10), thinks (p. 8) the notice can't have been posted at a barber's (why not?), and suggests (p. 11) this is simply where the Riding (τριττός), in which Dekeleia was (the Inland Riding of Hippothontis), had its parade station. The name of this Riding was, however, inscribed in I.G. I². 901, line 3, and was pretty certainly not Δεκελειεῖς. I am republishing this inscription in the *Mélanges Glotz*: read (c. 12-letter lines) δευρε H[ε]κποθ[ο]ν [τ]ριτ[ος] φυ[λα]τε[λε]ι[ν]ται ἤε (or ἤε, certainly not ἡε or δε) [. . . . ο]ν δε τριτ[ος]—. The other two Ridings of Hippothontis are *Peiraeieis* and *Eleusinioi*.—I also question Domaszewski's translation of προσφοιτᾶν = 'to parade.' The phylarchoi in Mnesimachos' comedy (quoted by Athen. 402-3—

στεῖχ' εἰς ἀγορὰν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑρμαῖς
οὐ προσφοιτᾶσ' οἱ φύλαρχοι)

are off duty.

³ *Arist. und Athen*. II. 261 sqq.—Szanto (*Rh. M.* XL., pp. 506 sqq.) had distinguished Demotionidai from Phrateres.

(on Wilamowitz's identification) the priest has a double function—priest of the whole and of a part: why then, when he is for the first time collecting a fine incurred by a vote of the 'whole,' is he for the first time called 'Priest of the part' (39-42)? It is certain the fine went to the treasury of the whole (43/4).

The 'so-called Demotionid Decrees' are, I believe, Decrees of the Dekeleieis. I will first develop my own case: next, argue against Wilamowitz:¹ last, face that most difficult question—who, then, are the Demotionidai?

§ 2. The two decrees, of Hierokles and Nikodemos, are written in the same hand. They may well have been passed at the same meeting; they certainly are intended to be read together: το δε ψηφισμα τοδε (sc. of Nikodemos) *προσαναγραψατω ο ιερειος εις την στηλην* (106/7).²—They are not, however, self-explaining: they refer to the Nomos of the Demotionidai and τα προτερα ψηφισματα, and simply supplement these. The two decrees both regulate procedure for admitting a new member.

Hierokles enacts:

A. An immediate emergency scrutiny (13-26). The Phrateres vote: any name refused is deleted from the list, the introducer is fined 100 drachmas.

B. Normal scrutinies for the future, in the year following the candidate's Koureion (26-45). The Phrateres vote:³ an introducer whose candidate is refused may appeal to the Demotionidai: if he is refused again, the introducer is fined 1,000 drachmas.

Nikodemos enacts:

A. A modification in the *anakrisis* or preliminary questioning (71-78). The three witnesses required must be from the introducer's Thiasos (unless it has too few members).

B. A modification in the scrutiny itself (78-106). Before the Phrateres vote, the introducer's Thiasos shall first vote by (secret) ballot: the votes shall then be counted in view of the Phrateres. The Phrateres then debate (the Thiasotai taking part) and vote (the Thiasotai abstaining). If the Thiasos has admitted and the Phrateres then refuse, the Thiasos shall be fined 100 drachmas⁴ (but those Thiasotai who, in the debate, signify their opposition, shall not contribute to

¹ I choose Wilamowitz out of homage to a book whose wide and cogent thinking has not been superseded. Subsequent writers, who all accept his main thesis (Demotionidai = Phrateres), have tinkered at details, but only to make inconsequent his subtle and consistent account.

² Had Theodorus set his graver to work to inscribe the first decree only, he would probably have got a larger or a smaller stele (or else used smaller or larger writing): either, that is, he would have got the decree on to one face, or spread himself comfortably over both. What he did was to get 58 lines on one face and 9½ on the other.

³ The subject of *φερειν την ψηφον απο το βωμο* is not named: it must be the Phrateres, as in a State decree the unnamed subject is the Athenians. It must also (one would suppose) be the same as in 15 sqq. above, *διαδικασαι τοσ φρατερας, φεροντας την ψηφον απο το βωμο*. But, since it is quite evidently the Dekeleieis (since appeal is then allowed from them to the Demotionidai, 30, cf. 32/3), and he refuses to equate the Dekeleieis with the Phrateres, Wilamowitz is forced to hold that the subject of *φερειν* is not the Phrateres.

⁴ *Centum*, not *centenas*: 100 drachmas in all, not 100 per Thiasote.

the fine). If the Thiasos has refused, the introducer may acquiesce (and then there is no fine) or appeal to the Phrateres: if they admit, good: if they refuse, the introducer is fined 100 drachmas.

The principle is constant: an adverse vote of the Phrateres involves a fine of 100 drachmas. Hitherto, the responsibility had lain with the introducer, who had paid the fine. Hierokles expressly enacts it for the emergency scrutiny. For the normal scrutiny, he does not need to enact it (he is concerned with another matter, viz.: appeal *from* the Phrateres, which if unsuccessful involves the tenfold fine of 1,000 drachmas). Nikodemos substitutes, for the conscience of the introducer, the ballot of the Thiasotai. If the introducer heeds their adverse voice, there is no fine: it is as if he had heeded his own conscience. If they encourage him, and he is refused by the Phrateres, the Thiasotai pay the fine: for they, his acting conscience, have failed him. If they refuse him, they decline the responsibility: the introducer is left to his own conscience. If he trusts it and the Phrateres allow his claim, well and good: but if they refuse him, he must pay the fine himself.

The principle is, I repeat, constant: the Thiasotai's ballot was made to replace the introducer's conscience, because (I imagine) it was likely to be more effective.¹ The Phratry was too big to trust its own judgment, so the Thiasoi are made responsible for their members. Nikodemos' two modifications are both in the same direction, more precaution against intruders.

§ 3. 'The Phratry is the Demotionidai: no one else but the *plenum* can give judgment on appeals, and the list of the Phrateres *εν Δημοτιωνιδων* can only be kept in the Phratry's house. Any other interpretation is wrong.' This is all the argument Wilamowitz devotes to the matter.

It is indeed remarkable that the Demotionidai have such importance: that their *νομος* prescribes the methods of scrutiny, that appeal is allowed to them from the Phrateres, that they keep the chief of the two Phratry-lists on their own premises. Remarkable: though not, I think, more irregular than the position Wilamowitz ascribes to the Dekeleieis. But I leave the Demotionidai till the next section, and will state now no more than what I consider evident—namely, that the Demotionidai are an aristocratic corporation, with a position of privilege and exegetic functions *vis-à-vis* the Phratry of the Dekeleieis.

Meanwhile, the following considerations seem fatal to Wilamowitz's view:

1. The Scrutiny (*Diadikasia*) is done by the Phrateres.² [*Ergo*, since

¹ If the introducer persists in trusting his own conscience, he may, but the Phratry has been warned. Without doubt the further appeal, to the Demotionidai, is still allowed if anyone chooses to risk the 1,000 drachmas.

² This is indeed allowed by many scholars (see Busolt-Swoboda, *Staatkunde*, p. 962, note 2) who yet cling to the equation *Phrateres* = *Demotionidai*. The consequences are astounding: I quote Swoboda: 'Es blieb also auch gestattet, gegen einen abweisenden Beschluss der Gesamtheit Berufung an dieselbe Versammlung einzulegen. Das war möglich, weil die Berufung ein

neues Verfahren in der Form einer gerichtlichen Verhandlung einleitete.' The appeal is from Demotionidai in Assembly to Demotionidai in Court: as it were, from the *Ekklesia* to the *Heliaia*. The thing only needs careful stating (as Swoboda gives it on p. 962) to be seen to be (at least) improbable: and if it were possible, it is not compatible with the words of the decree. Appeal from *Ekklesia* to *Heliaia* could not be called *εν Αθηναιουσ*, nor could appeal 'from Demotionidai in Phratry to Demotionidai in Court' be called *εν Δημοτιωνιδας*. I therefore disregard this hypothesis.

appeal is allowed from these Phrateres to the Demotionidai (30, cf. 32/3), the equation 'Phrateres = Demotionidai' cannot stand.] This is expressly stated in line 15 (*διαδικασαι τοσ φρατερας*), but Wilamowitz claims that the emergency scrutiny there meant should be carefully distinguished from the normal scrutinies.¹ A normal Diadikasia is described in some detail in lines 78 sqq. The phratriarch presides, all the Phrateres are present: the main business is (as in a State Ekklesia) a Debate followed by a Vote. Nikodemus inserts (as a special preliminary to the actual Diadikasia) a secret ballot of the Thiasotai. [That this secret ballot is *not* the Diadikasia is self-evident: it is put beyond question by line 94, the Thiasotai who wish to escape the fine must make their opposition clear *εν τη διαδικασιαι*: this cannot be 'in the secret ballot.' It is, of course, 'in the Debate,' for the Thiasotai have to abstain in the final Vote (103-6).]

Since then both the emergency and the normal Diadikasiai are done by the Phrateres, it is inconceivable that the unexpressed subject of *φερειν την ψηφον* in 29 can be other than *τοσ φρατερας*. Nor will anyone who is familiar with the language of Attic Decrees deny the strong presumption that this is so: the subject of such infinitives is the body which votes the decree: *εδοξεν τοισ φρατερσιν . . . φερειν την ψηφον*: *εδοχσεν τει βολει και τοι δεμοι . . . αποδουαι τα χρηματα . . . ταμιασ αποκναμενεν* (*I.G.* I². 91, lines 2, 13, etc.): *et passim*.

2. The uses of *οι φρατερες*, *Δεκελειησ*, *ο Δεκελειων οικος*, correspond respectively to *ο δημοσ*, *Αθηναιοι*, *ο δημοσ ο Αθηναίων* in State decrees. The instances illustrate this of themselves: I take one instance which is particularly clumsy on Wilamowitz's view (see p. 136 above). The fine of 1,000 drachmas is consequent on a vote of the Demotionidai, but goes to the common treasury: therefore the language is more explicit than usual, 'the priest of the *Dekeleia Lodge* shall be responsible for collecting it, or any Phrater who chooses may collect it for the common treasury'² (41-44).

3. *The tariff of fines is constant.* An adverse vote of the Phrateres costs 100 drachmas, an adverse vote of the Demotionidai costs 1,000 drachmas (see p. 137 above). The current view is that when the Thiasoi replaced the Dekeleieis as preliminary investigators, the fine for appeal to the Phratry was reduced by nine-tenths: I submit that this is astounding.³ The appeal to the Demotionidai is appeal *beyond* the Phratry, and is correspondingly expensive.

4. In Attic procedure, *Synegoroι* are sometimes assessors (e.g. *Αθ. πολ.*

¹ P. 260. 'Hopeless from the start are all modern explanations which confuse this emergency ruling with the normal institutions which follow.'

² The money will not be paid twice, as Wilamowitz suggests (p. 261, note 4). If either the priest hands over 100 drachmas (no matter whence) or a Phrater chooses to save him the trouble, the transaction is closed.

³ It is against the whole tenour of the new regulations, which are tightening the strictness of admission.

⁴ *Λογιστὰς δέκα καὶ συνηγόρους τούτοις δέκα*: i.e. they co-operate with the bench. Cf. *Lex. Rhet. Cant.*, p. 672. 20, *λογισταὶ . . . καὶ ἄλλοι δέκα συνήγοροι οἵτινες συνανακρίνουσι τοῖσι*. They help conduct the enquiry and pronounce the decision: they are not briefed for prosecution or defence. A very close parallel in *I.G.* II². 1183, lines 14-15, decree of the Deme Myrrhinous: (*ομνυναι*) *τοὺς συνήγορους* 'συνηγόρησεν τῷ δήμῳ *τα δίκαια καὶ ψήφισθαι α α ν μοι δοκεῖ (sic) δίκαιο-τάτα εἶναι*.'

54. 14)
accuse
whole
vice ve
the wi
they a
improp
(lines

§
I
questi
that a
who t
cratic
genera
and w
V
State'
the Fe
concei

T
as ass
with v
ably s
10 Sy
the S
Statut
Phrat
so far
of it.
Areop
fortun

1 De
phanes
view o
standin
cates'),
words,
support
pointed
Pericles
peachin
makles
Bouleu
them i
(sc. th
οὐστνω
δέκα, δ

54. 1⁴), sometimes advocates (e.g. Hypereides, *pro Euxenippo* 12), sometimes accusers.¹ I have taken them to be assessors, appointed by and from the whole body as assessors to their small standing committee. It is impossible *vice versa*: if the Dekeleieis are only a part, they cannot appoint assessors to the whole. Wilamowitz recognizes this, and takes Synegoroi as accusers: they are to lay the Dekeleieis' case before the whole Phratry. I submit it is improper for accusers to take an oath as to what *verdict* they will permit (lines 36/7).

§ 4. Who are the Demotionidai?

I have kept this to the end: the most difficult, and the most interesting, question. Now that I have established (beyond reasonable doubt, as I hope) that appeal was allowed from the Phrateres to the Demotionidai, we can enquire who they are, and possibly enlighten our generalities about the nature of aristocratic privilege. It is disastrous to block enquiry at the start by a preconceived generality. Our notions about the Attic aristocracy are exceedingly insecure, and we have to cut *them* to fit the instances, not the instances to fit *them*.

Whose vote could possibly be valid against that of the Phrateres? The State's:² but the Demotionidai are not the State: nor are they a Tribe (one of the Four or one of the Ten): and there is no corporation known to us (or readily conceivable) which could be intermediate between the Phratry and the State.³

The Phratry appoints 5 Synegoroi to sit *in addition to* the Demotionidai, as assessors⁴ representing the Phratry. This suggests to me (I am not sure with what degree of cogency) that the Demotionidai are themselves a reasonably small body: thus for instance the State Logistai, 10 in number, are given 10 Synegoroi.⁵ I imagine them as a small committee of experts, keepers of the Statute Book (line 14, cf. 21: i.e. νομοφύλακες) and *Exegetai* of the Statutes: these functions are of course hereditary. Their relation to the Phratry is something like that of the House of Lords to a Common Jury, in so far as they are the *experts* of the community and not merely representatives of it. A closer parallel, and closer home, is the relation of the Eupatrid Areopagites to the citizen body in seventh-century Athens. It is our fortune that in the small world of the Phratry privilege was not so jealously

¹ Dem. *Meidias* 112, and frequently in Aristophanes, e.g. *Acharn.* 685, 705, *Wasps* 691. The view once held by Hermann, that these are standing public prosecutors (or 'Treasury Advocates'), is, I think, untrue: rather (in Sophocles' words, *Trach.* 814) τῷ κατηγορῶ συνήγοροισι, they support the prosecutor. Public prosecutors (appointed *ad hoc*) are called κατηγοροί in Plut. *Pericles* X. 6. The συνήγοροι in the decree impeaching Antiphon Archeptolemos and Onomakles (ps.-Plut. *X Or.* 833E), appear to be Bouleutai chosen by the Strategoi to support them in the prosecution: παρασχόντων δ' αὐτοῦς (sc. the accused) οἱ στρατηγοί, καὶ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς οὕστινας ἂν δοκῇ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς προσελομένους μέχρι δέκα, ὅπως ἂν περὶ παρόντων γένηται ἡ κρίσις: and

then κατηγορεῖν τοὺς ἡρημένους συνηγῶρους καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς.

² Solon gave all corporations power to make their own laws unless the State chooses to interfere. *Lex apud Gaium Dig.* XLVII. 22. 4.

³ It has been supposed that the Δυναστεῖα, whose inscription (*I.G.* II². 1241) mentions two Phratrarchoi, are a 'geminated' Phratry. If this is so, the original Phratrarchai do not apparently continue their separate existence. We have no evidence of any unit which subdivides the State and is subdivided into functioning Phratrarchai: I think we may safely deny that any existed.

⁴ See the end of § 3 above.

⁵ *Αθ. πολ.* 54. 2. The 30 Logistai of the fifth century have disappeared.

challenged as in the State, and consequently we see in the Phratry of 396/5 a microcosm of the archaic State, with certain noticeable distortions.

Until Solon, the Areopagus was the seat of pure aristocracy: its members were 'Eupatrids,' scions of certain houses of heroic descent, who inherited certain priestly functions and a certain religious competence. In virtue of these functions and this competence they could render great service to the State by dealing with cases of bloodshed, pollution, sacrilege, etc. Whether this was the first nucleus of their more general legal competence, I could not say. Violence is perhaps the most difficult thing a primitive state has to regulate, but it is not the only thing, nor was religion unconcerned in these other cases. The archaic state was regarded, seriously and literally, as a religious entity, whose welfare and health was the concern of certain Gods and Heroes. The distinction between sacred and secular law came very slowly, and so late as 550 B.C. what seems to us a commercial case is partly dealt with by Delphi (Hdt. VI. 86). Common Law in England resides in the breasts of His Majesty's Judges: in seventh-century Athens it resided in the breasts of the Areopagites, and since till Drakon there was no Statute Law, Common Law there comprised the whole field of Criminal, Civil and Constitutional law and custom.

This was the basis of the Areopagites' powers. They claim, like Kallias in the fifth century, *νόμον πάτριον λέγομεν*.¹ They were a Court of Law and gave judgments: at first, out of their own breasts; and then, when Statute Law began, they became 'Guardians of the Laws,' and kept and controlled the Statute Book. The political decline of Aristocracy began with the arrival of the *nouveaux riches* in the seventh century. Solon was bound to take account of them and admit them to the Areopagus; and so that body, losing its hereditary character, lost the true foundation of its powers. It was more than a century before those powers collapsed: for the Areopagites, although secularized, were men of experience, and their *expertise* (though no longer inherited with their blood) was still useful to the State. They continued until Ephialtes to give judgment in lawsuits and to have the last word, as legal experts, in admitting Statutes to the Statute Book.²

After 461 the State was almost wholly secular: Ephialtes completed the process which Solon had begun and Kleisthenes had drastically continued.³ We shall find nothing in this secular State to compare with the Demotionidai, unless such pale survivals of Eupatridhood as the *Exegetai*: these may indeed give us our closest analogies, and to them I will return.

* * * * *

¹ Andoc. *Myst.* 116.

² Νομοφυλακία: I regret that Mr. Walker in *C.A.H.* V., pp. 98-100, is inclined to doubt this meaning. For the sense of the terms 'Statute' (*νόμος*) and 'Statute Book' (*κειμενοὶ νόμοι*): for the practical identity (at least till Eukleides) of *νόμος* and *ψήφισμα*: for the distinction between the Statute Book and Solon's Code, etc.: see

J. Schreiner, *De corpore iuris Atheniensium* (Dissert. Bonn, 1913): a work remarkable for the candour and cogency of its argument, and for the importance of its subject.

³ Solon by admitting *βέβηλοι* to the Areopagus: Kleisthenes by building the State out of *Demes* instead of *Thiasoi*.

Meanwhile, the Areopagites. The powers of the Demotionidai are based on the same hereditary competence with regard to *law*, which is still regarded as sacred law, as those of the Areopagites in their prime. The Law of the Phratry perhaps still resides unwritten in their breasts;¹ if not, it resides written in their keeping. The interpretation of the law, in the last instance, lies with them. I do not suggest that the Demotionidai had as much effective power in the Phratry as the Areopagites in seventh-century Athens. Membership of the Phratry was a matter of consequence in the secular world outside, so the Phrateres have taken their precautions. They freely vote additional psephismata: they appoint assessors to the Demotionidai: and (this is the real anomaly) the Demotionidai have become a court of last instance, i.e. they can override the Phrateres only to admit (not to reject) a candidate.

The anomaly is grave. That experts should form the court of last instance is familiar to us: but in Athens the practice was contrary. Once the non-experts could form an opinion at all, that opinion was final. The Areopagites never were a court of appeal from the Heliaia: so soon as the two courts existed, the Heliaia's verdict was final. Wilamowitz's argument ('no one else but the *plenium* can give judgment on appeals') is therefore strong, but it will not stand against the weight of evidence. *The anomaly exists*: a consequence of archaic religion surviving into the secular conditions of the fourth century.²

* * * *

The Exegetai were in a similar position.

When Solon secularized the Areopagite Court, he converted its judgments from *ἐξηγήσεις* (such as 'Theseus' had intended, Plut. *Theseus*, 25. 2) to *συμβούλευσεις*: it is no longer an authoritative verdict, but only an expert opinion. No doubt the opinion was commonly unchallenged: but in principle (since the appeal was allowed) it could be challenged. What power of growth that principle held is well known. In fourth-century Athens, a man jealous for the absoluteness of the pronouncements sanctioned by religion needed to be agile and circumspect: the Exegetai, questioned by [Demosthenes'] client on a matter of behaviour and ritual, are careful to enquire *πότερον ἐξηγήσονται μόνον ἢ καὶ συμβουλέωσιν* (XLVII. 68). 'Both,' says the client: and they answer *ἡμεῖς τοῖνυν σοι τὰ μὲν νόμιμα ἐξηγησόμεθα τὰ δὲ σύμφορα παραινέσομεν*. Plato, in whose *Laws* the Exegetai are of great consequence, is emphatic that in its own sphere Exegesis is absolute: *τὰ μὲν περὶ τὰ θεῖα νόμιμα* etc., *τοὺς ἐξηγητὰς γίγνεσθαι κυρίους φράζοντας* (958D: cf. 775A).³

The Democracy though secular was not 'anti-clerical.' Lysias (VI. 10)

¹ Cf. Lysias VI. 10, Plato, *Laws* 845E, 916C: all quoted below.

² To invest a smaller body than the *plenium* with final powers *ad hoc* is a procedure not unknown in Athens. It is the famous *Autokratia*: cf. Andoc. *Resce* 33, *αὐτοκράτορας γὰρ πεμφθῆναι εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα διὰ ταῦθ', ἵνα μὴ ἐπαναφέρωμεν*: *Myst.* 15, *ψηφισαμένης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς, ἣν γὰρ αὐτο-*

κράτωρ (cf. Thuc. VIII. 67. 3, and *I.G.* I². 298, lines 14-15). These are concessions to that notion of the finality of *expertis*, which the pure democratic doctrine denied.

³ Plato's Exegetai have their own Law: 845E *οἱ τῶν ἐξηγητῶν νόμοι*: 916C *κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐξηγητῶν νόμον*. Cf. line 14 of our inscription, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον τῶν τῶν Δημοτιωνιδῶν*.

quotes Perikles' dictum *μὴ μόνον χρῆσθαι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις νόμοις περὶ τῶν ἀσεβούντων ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀγράφοις καθ' οὓς Εὐμολπίδαι ἐξηγοῦνται*. In their sphere (whose delimitation, like that of Delphi's, was a matter of tact and realism) the Exegetai were not advisers to the sovran Demos, but givers of commands to be obeyed: at the least, of authoritative pronouncements to be believed. It was sometimes very hard to delimit the sphere: for most Athenians believed in their religion, and if it *did* affect public life on vital matters, it was not easy to disregard it.¹ The most famous occasion² was the restoration of Alcibiades after his exile. Religion had been mobilized against him, it had now to be demobilized: the Demos asked the Eumolpid Hierophant to take off the curse. 'If he is innocent, I never cursed him' was the dignified (or pedantic) reply with which the Hierophant affirmed his independence.³ Not all the psephismata in the world could alter the *fact*, that if Alcibiades had committed sacrilege, the curse of the Goddesses was on him.

The Hierophant's authority was the *ἄγραφοι νόμοι καθ' οὓς Εὐμολπίδαι ἐξηγοῦνται*.⁴ The authority of the Demotionidai rests similarly on *ὁ νόμος ὁ τῶν Δημοσιωνιδῶν*. I imagine they took their function seriously and gave judgment as technical experts: if they had admitted private rancours, they would hardly have survived. Such privilege is indeed threatened as often by the suspicion of the unprivileged as by the real corruption of the privileged. The precaution against any such suspicion or sense of hocus-pocus was the five assessors. Chosen by and from the unprivileged, they sat with the court and saw that the *expertise* was real.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

H. T. WADE-GERY.

APPENDIX: ΔΕΚΕΛΕΙΕΙΣ (P. 135, note 1).

That Dekeleieis is the name of a Phratry as well as of a Deme, I believe to be certain.

The distinction between Demesmen and Phrateres which I posit in Herodotus IX. 73. 2 and Lysias XXIII. 2-3 is not, however, certain. My hypothesis is, that both are commonly and correctly called *Δεκελειεῖς*, but Demesmen could be called more distinctively *τοῦ δήμου Δεκελεῖθεν* or *Δεκελείοθεν δημοτενόμενοι*, and this is done in these two passages: in our Decrees, on the other hand, no such distinction is made or intended, since *Δεκελειησ* means the Phratry throughout.

It is clear on any hypothesis that Deme and Phratry had much the same personnel, and the chances were, if you belonged to one you belonged to the other. For I take it as certain that the 'Rendezvous of the Dekeleieis' is

¹ In Plato, *Euthyphro* 4B, a (private) matter of life and death is left to the Exegetai.

² On an even more famous occasion, the *χρησμόλογοι*, whose opinion Themistocles combats (Hdt. VII. 143), are clearly not speaking *ex cathedra*.

³ Plut. *Alcib.* XXIII. 3. The Hierophant was not actually one of the Exegetai, but his authority was exactly analogous.

⁴ Cf. *I.G.* I². 76, lines 36-37, *καθοτι αν Ευμολπίδαι [εχσθη|γο]νται*.

the same (a) in our Decrees and (b) in the almost exactly contemporary speech of Lysias: and it is used (a) for posting notices of the Phratry and (b) for enquiring about Demesmen. Moreover a high proportion of Phrateres, in the Decrees, are Demesmen: and (on my hypothesis) Sophanes is both Demesman and Phrater. The two aspects, however, are distinct.

The matter of my hypothesis is then (I hope) clear: *Herodotus and Lysias, concerned to distinguish the two aspects, Demesman and Phrater, use a distinctive phrase for the former.* I base the hypothesis chiefly on the use of the distinctive phrase, which otherwise is not readily accounted for. And Herodotus' language 'ἐκ δήμου Δεκελεῖθεν, Δεκελέων δὲ τῶν, etc.' is more natural if he is distinguishing two aspects: though this is not conclusive, since the δέ may be the exegetic δέ of which he is fond. Whether the honours at Sparta of which Herodotus goes on to speak were reserved for Phrateres or Demesmen, I cannot say, and I suspect few Spartans could.

Herodotus is uncertain whether it was *Dekelos* or the *Dekelees* who helped the Tyndaridai, and he does not say explicitly that the 'Dekelees' of whom Sophanes was one were regarded as descendants of Dekelos. Yet I believe it is safe to assume that they were, and this brings me to the last point: was the fiction of an eponymous ancestor ever applied to a Deme? I think not. It is clear at least that the descendants of Philaios were *not* the Demesmen of the Deme Philaidai (where his sanctuary lay) but the Gennetai of the Genos Philaidai (e.g. the older Miltiades, the philosopher Epicurus, etc.).¹ The ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ δήμου from whom Lysis of Aixone was descended (Plato, *Lysis* 205D) may possibly have been called Aixon,² but it was hardly as Demesman of Aixone that Lysis traced his ancestry, rather as member of some locally-rooted Genos or Phratry: cf. the Eumolpidai at Eleusis. The Kleisthenic Phratry was no doubt as artificial as the Deme: but the Phratry's fiction was descent, the Deme's fact was domicile.

¹ Hdt. VI. 35. 1: Plut. *Solon* X. 3: Diog. Laert. X. 1: Toepffer, *Att. Geneal.*, pp. 269 sqq.

² More likely his daughter was Aixone. Cf. the passage in Plato, and Ed. Meyer, *Forsch.*

II. 521, note 3: who unwarrantably translates ἀρχηγέτης τοῦ δήμου 'Ahnherr des Demos.' Rather, 'King' or possibly 'founder': to call him 'ancestor' begs the question.

PUGILUM GLORIA (TER. *HEC.* 33).

CICERO (*Inu.* 2, 166) defines *gloria* as *frequens de aliquo fama cum laude*, 'much talk about a person to his praise.' When the talk is by the person himself, the word takes the signification 'boast' (as early as Plaut. *Mil.* 22 *gloriarum plenior*).

Terence complained that the performance of his *Hecyra* was marred by *pugilum gloria* (and by *funambuli expectatio*). Some editors interpret 'boastful pugilists.' But Cicero's definition gives the true interpretation. Rumour of a coming boxing-match reached the theatre and the audience began to talk excitedly about the prowess of the boxers, just as the Trojans fell to talking (*magnum murmur*) about the prowess of Dares (*Aen.* V. 368 sqq.):

Nec mora; continuo uastis cum uiribus effort
ora Dares magnoque uirum se murmure tollit:
'solus qui Paridem solitus contendere contra,' etc.

Since Plautus uses *ita*, not *eae*, in Phronesium's remark (*Truc.* 88g):

Quae quom multum apstulimus, hau multum <eius>
apparet quod datum est:
ita sunt gloriae meretricum,

he probably means 'this is the strain in which people talk of our powers'; and *gloriae meretricum* will then be a kindred phrase to *pugilum gloria*.

The interpretation 'boastful pugilists' may be due to a misunderstanding of *gloriosi* in Donatus' note. Donatus says that *pugilum gloria, expectatio funambuli* is tantamount to *gloria pugilum, gloria funambuli*, although, strictly speaking, *expectatio* has the sense of *desiderium*, whereas *gloria* has the sense of *πολλολογία* (like the *magnum murmur* of *Aen.* V. 369), and adds that since the boxers were *gloriosi*, it was less disgrace for Terence to be ousted by them. Clearly he does not mean 'boastful' by *gloriosi*.

Funaioli's recent book (*Esegesi Virgiliana Antica*, Milan, 1930) shows how Hagen's *obscura diligentia* has distorted the *Sylloge Philargyriana* (or rather *Filagryana*; cf. Heraeus, *Rhein. Mus.* 79, 391). If my readers accept my report of Donatus' scholium on *Hec.* 33, they will admit that the Teubner edition of Donatus' *Commentum Terenti* is not so much an edition as an apograph whose diligent reproduction of the MSS. obscures our view of what Donatus actually wrote.

For the scholium is so presented by Wessner (for *haec est* I would read *hoc est*):

PUGILUM GLORIA περίφρασις ἀντὶ τοῦ pugiles. Sed etiam gloriosi,
ut minus turpe sit antelatos eos esse, sicut Vergilius 'magnis cum

uiribus e. o. D. m. q. u. s. m. t. s. q. P., etc. Haec est gloria pugilum, gloria funambuli.

PUGILUM GLORIA F. <E.> A. EXSPECTATIO πολυλογία: 'pugilum gloria f. <e.> a. e. comitum conuentus' <etc.>.

EXSPECTATIO desiderium, ut Vergilius 'exspectate uenis.'

Previously in this journal (XIX. 28; XX. 103) I have shown that the lemmas (in capitals) should all (or about all) be ignored as later accretions. It is all very well for Wessner to plead that in his Preface he drops a hint that these lemmas are not invariably genuine. But his hint is insufficient to guard his readers from error. Thus the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, s.v. *caueo*, has been misled by Wessner into the statement that Donatus' text of Terence had *illa*, not *illam*, at *Eun.* 223. And see how the insertion of these headings perverts our understanding of Donatus' view of this passage. The second heading should be merely GLORIA, and the note merely πολυλογία. Moreover, the repetition of the heading leaves an erroneous suggestion of a 'variorum' commentary.

No; what the Teubner text gives us is an apograph. We need an edition. And the editor must concentrate his mind on *Ueberlieferungsgeschichte*. I fancy that it will turn out that Donatus' commentary, unaccompanied by a text of Terence, was transferred by Irish *magistri* to the margins of their own MSS. of Terence. This transference necessitated reduction of the commentary, more or less reduction according to the width of the margins. It necessitated also the division of a scholium, part of the scholium being put in the left-hand margin and part in the right-hand margin. Finally, at a later time, the marginal notes were taken out and became again a commentary (unaccompanied by a text of Terence). But oh how changed! Funaioli shows us that something similar happened to the Virgil-commentary.

But it is unlucky that Funaioli has not seen the significance of the fact that in the one tradition (a) the notes are Irish, while in the other (b) they are Breton. That implies that the a-version passed directly from Ireland to the Continent, whereas the b-version went from Ireland through South-West England (or Wales) to Brittany (and Fleury).

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE UNIVERSITY, ST. ANDREWS.

MISCELLANEA—VIII.

1. HOMERIC HYMN TO APOLLO 334:

κέκλυτε νῦν μοι γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρύς ὑπερθεν,
Τιτῆνες τε θεοὶ τοὶ ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάοντες
τάρταρον ἀμφὶ μέγαν, τῶν ἐξ ἄνδρες τε θεοὶ τε.

Sikes and Allen here say 'τοί is of course a relative pronoun,' and therefore the participle is difficult to explain. This is the last ripple from a stone cast by August Matthiae in 1800, who observed 'nec praecedit nec sequitur uerbum quo participium ναιετάοντες referatur, sed anacoluthum est. dicere nimirum uolebat οἱ ὑπὸ χθονὶ ναιετάοντες ἄνδρας τε θεοὺς τε ἐφύσατε, sed subito constructionem immutauit. neque enim quemque fore puto qui haec ita accipiat Τιτῆνες οἱ ναιετάοντες articuli cum participio iuncti usum huc trahens.' In obedience to this dictum Ilgen wrote ναιετάουσιν, Peppmüller intercalated Hesiod, *Theog.* 622, and S. and A. regarded 'the sentence as an example of the analytic construction with εἶναι with the auxiliary (εἰσίν) omitted,' in support of which they collected a certain amount of lore.

All this is hasty. Οἱ (οἶ) in epos is relative, demonstrative, and articular. Τοί everyone knows is relative and demonstrative. Why—seeing that it is the same word as οἶ—cannot it also be articular? The answer is that it is.

Ω 686 σεῖο δέ κε ζωὴ καὶ τρὶς τόσα δοῖεν ἄποινα
παῖδες τοὶ μετόπισθε λελειμμένοι αἶ κ' Ἀγαμέμνων
γνώῃ σ' Ἀτρεΐδης, γνῶσι δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί.

There are no scholia; a minority of MSS. give τοι (i.e. the particle), recognizing which Eustathius says ἀντὶ τοῦ οἶ ἔτι ζῶντες, τοῦ τοῖ δωρικῶς λεχθέντος ἀντὶ τοῦ οἶ προτακτικοῦ πληθυντικοῦ ἄρθρου, εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἐγκλιτικῶς γράφουσι παῖδές τοι. But the construction obviously demands the article. This therefore is the first case in epos of τοί articular, the line from the Hymn is the second.

Another example of a disregarded article is T 500 ἄντυγες αἰ περὶ δίφρον, where the MSS. vary between αἰ (majority) and αἷ.

2. K 544 εἴπ' ἄγε μ' ὦ πολύναι' Ὀδυσσεῦ μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν
ὅππως τούσδ' ἵππους λάβετον καταδύντες ὄμιλον
Τρώων, ἣ τίς σφωε πόρεν θεὸς ἀντιβολήσας
αἰνῶς ἀκτίνεσσιν ἐοικότες ἡελίοιο.

D. B. Monro in his *Homeric Grammar* has a paragraph (163, p. 115) which he calls 'Interjectional Nominative.' The epithet I presume is traditional, for the same sort of expression occurs in §BT on the line: διὰ τῆς μεταβάσεως τῶν πτώσεων τὸ τοῦ θαυμάζειν ὁράται μέγεθος ὡς κακεῖ [436]. In Kühner-

Gerth I., § 356. 3, the like collection appears as *Nominativ als Ausruf*. In both lists there are many examples where interjection or exclamation is not apparent. At K 436 (also about horses), quoted by the scholiasts,

τοῦ δὴ καλλίστους ἵππους ἶδον ἢ δὲ μεγίστους·

λευκότεροι χιόνος, θέλειν δ' ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι·

the statement is tranquil, and on the same level as the line before. No doubt, as \$A remarks, καθ' ἑαυτὸ λεγόμενον πλείονα ἔμφασιν παρίστησιν, two clauses are better than one; but it is a case of predication with the verb-copula omitted, a phenomenon universal in Greek and Latin, and due not to a desire for emphasis but to save time. In K 547, therefore, εἰκότες [εἰσί] = εἰκόασιν. (Λεῖπει τὸ εἰσὶ \$A). This no doubt is possible, as in the *v.l.* Ψ 180,

πάντα γὰρ ἤδη τοι τετελεσμένα ὥσπερ ὑπέστην,

and λ 606

ὁ δ' ἐρεμνῇ νυκτὶ εἰκόως

γυμνὸν τόξον ἔχων καὶ ἐπὶ νευρήφιν οἰστὸν

δεινὸν παπταίνων αἰεὶ βαλέοντι εἰκόως,

where one participle (the first) must be made finite (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τὸ ἦν \$H3). It is curious, too, that in Ψ 60, at N 102, we find εἰκότες [ἦσαν] for εἰκέσαν. Still, I have the feeling that there is a step between λευκότεροι χιόνος ἦσαν and ἀκτίνεσσιν εἰκότες ἦσαν, and I conjecture that the intervention of καταδύντες in 545 has by homoeomeson written εἰκότες for εἰκότας, which two of Ludwich's MSS. preserve. The preceding lines will then be a hyperbaton.

3. η 66

τὴν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ποιήσατ' ἄκοιτιν,

καὶ μιν ἔτισ' ὥς οὐ τις ἐπὶ χθονὶ τίεται ἄλλη,

δοῖσαι νῦν γε γυναῖκες ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν οἶκον ἔχουσιν.

69

ὥς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηται τε καὶ ἔστιν

ἔκ τε φίλων παίδων, ἔκ τ' αὐτοῦ Ἀλκινόοιο.

There are no \$ on line 67, nor paraphrase in Eustathius, from which it may be supposed that no difficulty was found in it. Still, the meaning of the apparent antithesis τετίμηται—ἔστι is by no means clear, as may be seen from the translations that are offered of it. One party supply τιμωμένη with ἔστιν, 'has been and is honoured,' a kind of reversal of the construction noticed above—verb-copula and no predicate; this it will be admitted is odd, and so is the distinction in time, 'she was and she is', the best that can be done for which is the version of Monsieur Victor Bérard, 'elle eut, elle a toujours le coeur et les hommages,' etc. Others again give a substantive meaning to ἔστιν: she has been honoured and exists, basing themselves on ω 263 ζῶει τε καὶ ἔστιν.¹ This may fairly be called otiose: why should Arete not exist because she was respected?

No, the passage requires more analysis than this, and to be brought under grammatical usage. It is a door with two keys—Hyperbaton and Tmesis. The former had great acceptance with the ancients. As considerable a writer as Strabo employs it to interpret Homer:

¹ And I suppose ο 433 ἦ γὰρ ἔτ' εἰσὶ καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται.

342 on Λ 757 'Αλεισίου ἔνθα κολώνη κέκληται he remarks ὑπερβατῶς δεῖ δέξασθαι ἴσον τῷ ἔνθ' 'Αλεισίου κολώνη κέκληται.

370 on Δ 171 καὶ κεν ἐλέγχιστος πολυδίψιον Ἄργος ἰκοίμην, he observes τοῦτο δ' ἦτοι ἀντὶ τοῦ πολυπόθητον κεῖται, ἢ χωρὶς τοῦ δ' πολυδίψιον . . . καὶ σὺν τῷ δ' δὲ ὑπερβατῶς δέχονται κατὰ τὴν συναλοιφὴν μετὰ τοῦ συνδέσμου τοῦ δέ· ἔν' ἢ οὕτως καὶ κεν ἐλέγχιστον πολὺ δ' ἴψιον Ἄργος ἰκοίμην. These are displacements of neighbouring words, or dissections of words: Demetrius of Scepsis went further. Strabo 489 on B 676

οἱ δ' ἄρα Νίσυρόν τ' εἶχον Κράπαθόν τε Κάσον τε
καὶ Κῶν Εὐρυπύλοιο πόλιν νήσους τε Καλύδνας,

remarks ὁ δὲ Σκήψιος πληθυντικῶς ὠνομάσθαι τὴν νήσον Καλύμνας φησὶν ὡς Ἀθήνας καὶ Θήβας, δεῖν δὲ ὑπερβατῶς δέξασθαι τὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ· οὐ γὰρ νήσους Καλύδνας λέγειν, ἀλλ' οἱ δ' ἄρα νήσους Νίσυρόν τ' εἶχον Κράπαθόν τε Κάσον τε καὶ Κῶν Εὐρυπύλοιο πόλιν Καλύδνας τε.

Again 585 on X 477,

Ἔκτορ ἐγὼ δύστηνος· ἰὴ ἄρα γεινόμεθ' αἶσῃ
ἀμφοτέροι, σὺ μὲν ἐν Τροίῃ Πριάμου ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Θήβῃσιν,

he says οὐκ οἴονται δεῖν ἐξ εὐθείας ἀκοῦν, σὺ μὲν ἐν Τροίῃ, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Θήβῃσιν ἢ Θήβῃσιν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὑπερβατὸν ἀμφοτέροι ἐν Τροίῃ, σὺ μὲν Πριάμου ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Θήβῃσιν. They were therefore prepared to admit what seem to us strange dislocations of order.

Cases of dislocation, consisting in the insertion of parentheses amounting to sentences, are given in Kühner-Gerth II., § 607, n. 5:

- N 476 ὧς μένεν Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτὸς οὐδ' ὑπεχώρει
Αἰνείαν ἐπιόντα βοηθόον.
Π 119 γυνὴ δ' Αἴας κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμονα ῥίγησέν τε
ἔργα θεῶν
Λ 375 ὁ δὲ τόξου πῆχυν ἀνελκε
καὶ βάλεν, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν ἄλιον βέλος ἔκφυγε χεῖρός,
ταρσὸν δεξιτεροῖο ποδός
π 4 Τηλέμαχον δὲ περισσαινὸν κύνες ὑλακόμωροι
οὐδ' ὕλαον προσιόντα.

To return to η 69 ὡς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηται τε καὶ ἔστι, the frequent collocations περὶ κῆρι τιμᾶν -ᾶσθαι guarantee the connexion of περὶ κῆρι τετίμηται, and with the parenthesis τε καὶ ἔστιν we must supply περὶ; that is to say, περὶ, instead of being actually repeated, as in

- Α 258 οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλήν· Δαναῶν περὶ δ' ἔστέ μάχεσθαι
Λ 550 ὃς περὶ μὲν εἶδος περὶ δ' ἔργα τέτυκτο
τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα,

and α 66, Φ 214, is understood, the line not admitting its second appearance.¹

¹ Some somewhat similar cases are to be found in Kühner-Gerth II., § 597 n.

Then *περί . . . τε καὶ ἔστιν* is a tmesis for *τε καὶ περίεστιν*. This verb in Homer means to surpass, not to survive:

σ 248 ἐπεὶ περίεσσι γυναικῶν
εἰδός τε μέγεθός τε ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον εἰσας
τ 325 δαίσεαι εἴ τι γυναικῶν
ἀλλάων περίεμι νόον καὶ ἐπιφρόνα μῆτιν,

where the context also is similar. The word is visibly divided at Θ 27 *τόσσον ἐγὼ περί τ' εἰμὶ θεῶν περί τ' εἰμὶ ἀνθρώπων*.

4. P 368 ἥερι γὰρ κατέχοντο μάχης ἐπὶ θ' ὅσσον ἄριστοι
ἔστασαν ἀμφὶ Μενoitιάδῃ κατατεθνηῶτι·
οἱ δ' ἄλλοι Τρῶες καὶ εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
εὐκηλοὶ πολέμιζον ὑπ' αἰθέρι.

Line 368 is one of the oddest to look at in Homer. Its solution is certain, and I should not have noticed it but that it is not clearly explained in the commentaries. The solution is provided by the passages contained in Ebeling at the beginning of the article "Ὅσος". The Athos MS. (A is missing) gives the construction: *ἔστι δὲ ὁ νοῦς οὗτος· ἐφ' ὅσον τῆς μάχης ἔστασαν οἱ ἄριστοι, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον σκότει κατείχοντο οἱ ἄριστοι*. Here (1) the genitive *μάχης ὅσσον* is defended by Λ 658 *οὐδέ τι οἶδεν | πένθεος ὅσσον ὁρώρε*, where \$A says *διασταλτέον ἦτοι ἐπὶ τὸ οἶδε ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ πένθεος*. ἔχει γὰρ ἀμφοτέρων λόγον. εἰ μὲν οὖν συνάπτοιτο τοῖς ἄνω τὸ πένθεος, λείπει τὸ περί, ὡς Ἐκτωρ χωόμενος Σαρπηδόνα· εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐξῆς, σχῆμα ἔσται ὅσον πένθος. Ἀττικὴ δὲ ἡ χρήσις καὶ ἀρχαία. The genitive with *οἶδα* finite is limited by the presence of adverbs. (2) *ἐπὶ θ' ὅσσον* is the equivalent of *ὅσσον ἐφ' B 616, Ψ 251, or ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ H 451, 458, O 358, Φ 251*. (3) The last four passages defend *θ'*, which has been the real stumbling-block. *Ἐπὶ* and *ὅσον* change their places, *τ'* is immovable. What the sense of *θ'* is I do not venture to say, the usage is quite clear. The particle is not inserted, as Leaf said, to fill the hiatus.

This is the interpretation, but the passage gave rise to many alterations. The vulgate of the MSS. have *ὅσσοι* for *ὅσσον*, getting rid of the partitive;¹ others read *μάχη(η)*; Aristophanes *μάχη ἐνι*; other ancients and some MSS. *μάχης ἐπι*, all with the same result. How Zenodotus constructed his *τόσσον* for *θ' ὅσσον* no one has explained, but it guarantees *θοσσον* or rather *τε οσσον*, which Zenodotus found.

5. Hesiod, *Theogony* 823, of Typhoeus:

οὐ χεῖρες μὲν ἔασιν ἐπ' ἰσχύϊ ἔργματ' ἔχουσαι
καὶ πόδες ἀκάματοι κρατεροῦ θεοῦ· ἐκ δὲ οἱ ὤμων
ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλὰὶ ὄφις δεινοῖο δράκοντος
γλώσσησιν δνοφερῇσι λελιχμότες, ἐκ δὲ οἱ ὄσσω
θεσπεσίης κεφαλῇσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν.

¹ This is commented on by \$BT: *ἔστι δὲ Μενoitιάδῃν ἔστασαν καὶ ἥερι κατείχοντο. οὕτως· ὅσοι γὰρ ἄριστοι ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην περί τὸν*

The commentators as collected in the note in Rzach's larger edition have no doubt that *ισχύι* = 'strength,' and some emend to make this sense clearer. But Typhoeus is described from below upwards. His active hands are ἐπ' *ισχύι*, he has also unwearied feet; on his shoulders are a hundred heads, fire flashes from his eyes. Similarly Circe μ 89 begins her description of Scylla with her twelve feet, going on to her six necks, with a head and three rows of teeth in each. The reverse order is followed by Antoninus Liberalis 28 in his description of Typhon: ἐπεφύκεσαν γὰρ αὐτῷ κεφαλαὶ πλείσται καὶ χέρες καὶ πτέρυγες, ἐκ δὲ τῶν μηρῶν μέγισται δρακόντων σπεῖραι.

Therefore in Hesiod *ισχύι* must denote a part of the body. Such words are ὀσφύι, *ισχίῳ*, *ἰξύνι*, or rather *ισχύς* is another form of *ἰξύς*. I read in Boisacq '*ἰξύς* = **ἰχούς* **ισχύς*.' Here we have the word in writing for 2,500 years. Further Hesychius has kept ἰσχι· ὀσφύς, and *ισχίον* is still with us, sciatics or not.

6. Zonaras 1716. 1 Tittmann has

τεινωδός· παρὰ τὸ ἐκτείνειν τὴν ᾠδήν.

To say 'τειν- Ionic, τενν- Aeolic,' is the work of a second to the practised conjecturer; and sure enough in Hesychius we find

τέννος· στέφανος ἐλαίινος, ἐρίῳ πεπλεγμένος.

The internal government of words in -ωδός varies. I see from Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's book that we do not know what τραγωδός means, and I can guarantee the same ignorance about ῥαψωδός. However, earlier in his lexicon Zonaras has the entry Ἀρνηδοί· οἱ ῥαψωδοί, ὅτι ἄρνα ἐλάμβανον, so we may conclude that the τεινωδός sang to obtain a garland. I see no reason to bring in ταινία, etc.

T. W. ALLEN.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

TERENCE QUOTATIONS IN SERVIUS AUCTUS.¹

IN dealing² with excerpts from Terence in the Servian Commentary on Virgil I deferred consideration of the material found only in the enlarged Commentary, on the ground that, if any difference of quality or character should appear in this material, it must be kept distinct from the work of Servius.

The question of the origin and nature of the additional comments, as a whole, will be found discussed in Thilo's Preface. Here it will suffice to state briefly that the compiler, though probably writing in Britain in the seventh century, had access to the sources which Servius employed, and to others as well. It follows that many of his quotations go back to a period anterior to Servius. Some may be fuller excerpts from the grammarians whom Servius abbreviated, others may give us words which Servius wrote but which have been garbled in the transmission of our Servius MSS., others again are possibly taken from the margins of contemporary copies of Virgil. These last, if we could isolate them, would probably be found the least interesting and trustworthy.

Without omitting any detail which might throw light on the subject, I shall compress into as narrow space as possible a description of all Terence quotations³ found in the enlarged Commentary.

In these lines no question of a variant reading arises, either in Serv. Auct. or in Terence: *Andr.* 29 (*Ecl.* vii, 9), 473 (*G.* iii, 60), 876 (*G.* iv, 444), 933 (*A.* i, 152), 533 (*A.* iii, 261), 311 (*A.* iv, 415), 31 (*A.* ix, 424) [the transposition *efficere ars* in Ter. D is unimportant. Cf. *Andr.* 345, *Eun.* 454, 1084], 345 (*A.* xii, 342); *Haut.* 476-7 (*Ecl.* vi, 58), 374 (*A.* iv, 606); *Eun.* 653 (*A.* i, 573; ii, 482; xii, 453), 54-5 (*A.* ii, 424), 83-4 (*A.* ii, 559), 317 (*A.* iv, 10), 934-5 (*A.* iv, 31), 320 (*A.* ix, 1), 304 (*A.* ix, 229), 587 (*A.* iv, 54), 1030 (*A.* xi, 352); *Phorm.* 318 (*A.* ii, 234; xi, 486), 74 (*A.* xii, 538), 203 (*A.* x, 284); *Hec.* 123 (*A.* iv, 448); *Ad.* 961 (*A.* i, 253), 501 (*A.* i, 445) [though C has *facillimi* and the rubric is the adjective *FACILEM: copiosam, diuitem*; and later in the line Ter. ACPL have the adjective *maximi* instead of the adverb], 28-9 (*A.* iii, 430). In *Haut.* 192 (*Ecl.* x, 46) it is important to have explicit evidence for *credere est*.

A good number of versions are loose or curtailed: *Andr.* 959-60 (*Ecl.* vii, 31) and 716 (*A.* i, 73) [in both words are transposed, and for that reason *ea propter* of the former hardly deserves serious consideration], 629 (*A.* xii, 694); *Haut.* 531 (*Ecl.* vi, 50), 300-1 (*G.* iv, 561) [omission of *primum* and transposition *qui ad dominas*], 365-6 (*A.* i, 657) [quotation from memory], 882 (*A.* iii, 430);

¹ I borrow this convenient title from the Oxford Terence to indicate the additions to the Commentary of Servius which are peculiar to the MSS. LVCPFGT and which are commonly designated *Scholia P. Danielis* from the name of

their first editor.

² *C.Q.*, XXIV, p. 183.

³ The Terence reference will be followed in each case by the reference to the line of Virgil under which the quotation stands.

Eun. 604-5 (G. i, 248) [transposition *mihi occasionem*], 1061-2 (A. i, 203), 1084-5 (A. xi, 352) [omission of *hoc* and transposition *recipiatis gregem*]; *Phorm.* 826 (G. i, 248) [transp. *nunc domum*], 830 (*Ecl.* vii, 31) [omission of *Phaedria*], 119 (G. i, 7) [transp. *pater ei*]; *Hec.* 618 (G. iii, 305) [transp. *nihil refert*]. For another point in this line see p. 153, l. 8]; *Ad.* 537 (A. iii, 477) [*quid est* for *quidnam est*, and possibly *en* for *em*], 197 (A. iv, 376) [loose quotation, with addition of *homines*, for the sense only], 319 (A. xii, 453) [transp. *agerem ruerem*], 985 (A. iii, 217) [*quae haec est subita* for *q. istaec sub. est*], 665 (A. iv, 408) [*credis* for *credit*].

That scribes are responsible for some mis-quotations is proved by *Phorm.* 826 (G. i, 248) where the point is definitely OSTENTUS: *ostensus* and yet the MSS. give *ostentata*; and by *Eun.* 471 (G. iv, 293) where the rubric USQUE: *e loco non in locum* betrays the absurdity of *ex Aethiopia usque in haec est* and the genuineness of *ex Aeth. usque haec est* which is given correctly at A. iv, 480; and again by *Hec.* 618 (G. iii, 305) where *illaec* (Nom. Pl. Fem.), the very point of the citation, is omitted.

Some other readings peculiar to Serv. Auct. are almost certainly due to faulty quotation or scribal carelessness: *Eun.* 582 (G. iii, 305) [*lauent* (Pl.) for *lavet*]. It is true that the context of the scene makes the Plural defensible, but in the absence of any variation in the tradition elsewhere it is safer to presume a very natural slip of the compiler or a copyist], 51 (A. i, 37) [*incipias* and *pertendas*, Subjunctive for Future], 943 (A. ii, 502) [*adulescentem* for *adulescentulum*, a clear slip because unmetrical]; *Phorm.* 1014 (G. iv, 488) [*commeritam*, the substitution of the compound for the simple verb], 62 (A. i, 73) [addition of *iam* before *hanc operam*]; *Hec.* 79 (G. i, 125) [*quaerit*, Present for Future]; *Ad.* 93 (A. iv, 195) [*in ore esse* for *in ore est*, though *esse* might conceivably be the exclamatory Infinitive], 361 (A. i, 6) [substitution of *incedere* for *ire*, and of *quid* for *ubi*; also possibly the order *hinc iam scibo* for *h. sc. i. (i. h. sc. Ter. A.)*], 498 (A. iii, 140) [*illum* for *illas*], 35-6 (A. iv, 379) [*redit* (unmetrical) for *rediit*].

Having cleared the ground we turn to the question whether it is possible to draw any inference as to the condition of the text of Terence at the time when the excerpts were made which are found in Servius Auctus. (I assume that, for the most part, the writer of the additional comments was merely a compiler from earlier sources.) The evidence consists of all instances where a version given by our text of Serv. Auct. appears in some of our MSS. of Terence but not in others. Is the A-text (that which we have in one copy, Codex Bembinus) of Terence implied? Or have we reason to believe that peculiarities of the δ or of the γ group of Terence MSS., or of these groups together (referring us back to their common parent the 'Calliopian' text), peculiarities which occur also in the Serv. Auct. we know, imply the existence of copies of Terence, or editions of Terence, with these peculiarities, as early as, or earlier than, the fourth century? Here one must insist that the evidence shall be weighed, not uncritically counted.

We put aside cases where an obviously late variant occurs in some of the

minusc
have q
would
had qu
statisti
Phorm.
But ot
has fid
Bemb.

604-5
of Serv
L thou
though
Cod. B
natura
an arg
would

T
985 (A
the γ g
prolu
certain
where
sapis¹
repres
abeas
of sapis
sapis c
have t
(A. i,

C
Ad. 9
ignor
editor
Ad. 6
corre
and p

¹ In
by Ter
² If
a sepa
liopian
³ D
Eun. 5

minuscule MSS. of Terence: *Haut.* 300-1 (G. iv, 561) [Ter. C²P²DLp²Ev²ηe have *quae*, not because it makes sense but because the proximity of *dominas* would lead astray nine scribes out of ten. Even if our MSS. of Serv. Auct. had *quae* (they have not), it would mean nothing—except to a blind devotee of statistics], 645 (A. ix, 289) [Ter. P¹P² have an explanatory addition, *tanto sit*]; *Phorm.* 74 (A. xii, 538) [Ter. *Schol.* D, F¹ have inserted, foolishly, *a* before *deo*]. But other instances are equally illusory: *Eun.* 943 (A. ii, 502) [Cod. Bemb. has *fidem deum*, nothing but a scribal transposition], *Hec.* 618 (G. iii, 305) [Cod. Bemb. has *fecerit*, because the copyist thought that *illaec* was Singular]; *Eun.* 604-5 (G. i, 248) [inevitable omission of *tantam* by the scribes of Ter. AC¹ and of Serv. Auct., after *ostentam* (-*ntatam*, wrongly, all Ter. MSS., and Serv. Auct. L though corrected)]; *Phorm.* 525-6 (A. i, 392) [addition of explanatory *te*, though not in the same position, by Cod. Bemb. and Serv. Auct. The scribe of Cod. Bemb. probably took it from above the line, while the grammarian would naturally add it in a quotation from memory]. To base on these four examples an argument for the disagreement or agreement with the A-text of Terence would be absurd.

The evidence for an early δ text of Terence is confined to one line: *Ad.* 985 (A. iii, 217) where Serv. Auct. and Ter. δ (but also the second hand of C from the γ group) have *proluviūm*. Nonius (373) and Eugraphius (373, 494) also have *proluviūm*. It is far more likely that the δ text took this version, which is certainly an old variant, from the grammarians. And we can point to cases where the δ text was not used: *Haut.* 379 (A. xi, 354), where Serv. Auct. has *sapis*¹ with most minuscule MSS. of Terence, but not D²p, which I take to represent the δ archetype. The grammarian's point is that, in the expression *abeas si sapias*, *abeas* is a polite Imperative. That would explain the substitution of *sapis* for *sapias* in a quotation from memory, and it would also explain how *sapis* could slip into the γ text. In *Eun.* 454 (A. iv, 461) Ter. DGL (δ group) have the order *visa sum vocem*, which is not shared by Serv. Auct. In *Ad.* 304 (A. i, 605) Serv. Auct. has not the added *est* of Ter. δ.

On the other hand, Serv. Auct. is three times opposed to the γ text:² *Ad.* 907 (A. x, 432) reading very definitely *turbas* for *turbam* of γ.³ (It was ignorance of the equation *TURBAS*: *perturbationes et strepitus* that led the γ editor to substitute *turbam*, because he thought the meaning was 'crowd'); *Ad.* 666 (A. iv, 408) reading *prior* where γ has *prius*; *Eun.* 51 (A. i, 37) reading correctly *pertendes* (actually-as) for the explanatory substitute *perficies* of γ; and possibly in *Phorm.* 830 (*Ecl.* vii, 31) omitting the characteristic γ addition *ea*.⁴

There remain five⁵ citations in which the witness of Serv. Auct. seems to

¹ In any case *sapis* cannot have been written by Terence, because it is unmetrical.

² If we assume for the moment that there was a separate γ text which differed from the 'Cal-liopian.'

³ D has been corrupted from γ MSS. Cf. *Eun.* 51, *Ad.* 666.

⁴ I do not attach much importance to this, however, because *Phaedria* also is omitted.

⁵ I do not add *Phorm.* 1014 (G. iv, 488), Serv. Auct. *quas* with Ter. Σ (except v¹ *quin*), and *-meritam*. The possibility of independent scribal error is too great.

be on the side of all the minuscule MSS. (Σ) of Terence against Codex Bembinus (A).¹ We shall see whether they prove anything.

(1) *Eun.* 684:

nunc tibi uidetur foedu' quia illam non habet.

A: ita etiam Nonius 304: nunc eo tibi uid. Σ (tibi om. C¹P):

nunc ti. uid. eo Iou.

Serv. Auct. (A. iii, 216), under FOEDISSIMA: *turpis*, gives *nunc heu uidetur*, etc. It is not certain that *heu* represents *eo*. As evidence it is inadmissible. At any rate it is a very insecure foundation on which to base a conclusion.²

(2) *Eun.* 1084-5:

recte facitis. unum etiam hoc uos oro ut mē in uostrum gregem
recipiatis 1084 A: hoc om. Σ. adoro³ D.

Serv. Auct. (A. xi, 352), under ETIAM: *adhuc*, has *unum etiam uos oro ut me in uestrum recipiatis gregem*. The position of *recipiatis* suggests a quotation from memory, and the grammarian's interest was in *etiam* alone. Therefore he might well omit *hoc*. On the other hand, it would be quite like the Calliopian text of Terence to omit *hoc* as redundant. We are not bound to infer that the grammarian copied out the line from an existing text without *hoc*.

(3) *Ad.* 665-6:

quid illi tandem creditis

fore animi misero quī illam consueuit prior?

qui illa A, Arusian 460: qui cum illa Σ: qui illam Don.

Serv. Auct. (A. iv, 408, quoting for the type of question only) has *quid illi tandem credis* (sic) *fore animi misero qui cum illa consueuit prior*. Strong as this instance may seem, Serv. Auct. does not attest *cum illa*. As in the preceding example, we can still argue that the 'Calliopian' text deliberately simplified, and that the compiler on whom Serv. Auct. drew, quoting from memory (*credis* suggests this), would naturally insert *cum*. It is significant that Arusian omits *cum*.⁴

(4) *Ad.* 907: Serv. Auct. (A. x, 432, on *turbas*) and Ter. Σ have the Acc. Pl. form *lampadas*, while Cod. Bemb. has *lapedes*. This is a point without significance (though *lampades* may be Terentian).

(5) *Ad.* 50 (A. x, 567, on *contra*) Cod. Bemb. has the freak reading *adsedulo*.

It will be observed that this material is far from convincing proof of an early 'Calliopian' text of Terence. And on the other side we can point to instances where Serv. Auct. coincides⁵ with Cod. Bemb. as opposed to Σ.

(1) *Hec.* 605 (A. iv, 435) has *redduc* (actually *reduc*) where Σ presents the 'modernized' form *reduce*.

¹ The agreement of Serv. Auct. with Σ in *Andr.* 849 (A. xi, 373), *responde* for the more idiomatic *respondes* attested by Donatus, must not be used as evidence in this connexion, because this line is not extant in Cod. Bemb.

² No explanation has yet been offered of the appearance of *eo* in the line. And it is curious that of the minuscule MSS. of Terence only CP¹ (γ group) omit *tibi*.

³ Is *adoro* of D due to a suprascript *ad* which in its turn was due to annotation from a com-

mentator who explained that *etiam* meant *adhuc* (or *ad hoc*)?

⁴ *Cum* is definitely ruled out as Terentian. For the constitution of the Terence text the rival variants are *illa* and *illam*. Klotz (*Philol. Wochenschr.* 50, 599) supports *illa* (Abl.) by Catullus 113, 1 (where the verb is *solere*). But the comment of Donatus, *dicebant ueteres hanc rem consueui*, is too circumstantial to be lightly set aside.

⁵ I have refused to take advantage of two purely chance agreements (p. 153, ll. 10-15).

(2) *Hec.* 618 (G. iii, 305), where, though it does not appear in the quotation, *illaec* (Nom. Pl. Fem.) is clearly implied, while Σ has the 'easy' *illae*.

(3) *Eun.* 268 (G. iv, 104; A. i, 436) *nimirum hic homines frigent*.

Σ omits *hic*, which the 'Calliopian' text presumably dropped owing to a scribal blunder.

(4) *Ad.* 790-1 (A. ii, 424) where Serv. Auct. explicitly attests *ilicet*, with Cod. Bemb., whereas the 'Calliopian' text had *scilicet*. It is true that Ter. L¹ (*ilicet*) implies that the δ archetype also had *ilicet*, but I interpret this as recovery, from the grammarians, of a good reading.

These four examples are more than sufficient to disable any argument that the Terence quotations in Serv. Auct. betray the early existence of other texts of Terence than the one we know, from Codex Bembinus, to have been current in the fourth or fifth century.

There is a residue of *puluisculus* to note. The quotations *Andr.* 139 (A. iv, 335), 533 (A. xii, 584); *Eun.* 204 (A. vii, 629), 236 (A. viii, 307) belong to Servius Proper. Only the introductory *Terentius* or *Terentius ait* or a fuller form of comment is in Serv. Auct. At *Aen.* xii, 342 the subscript note of the MS. T (*pro ambo antique*) shows how epitomators might modify an original comment (*antiquo more 'ambo'*).

I add, though Serv. Auct. is not involved, *Haut.* 365, because we can deduce from it the important fact that the δ edition or archetype (Δ) was constituted at a later date than the 'Calliopian.' That is, Δ is a modification of an already existing 'Calliopian' text. Cod. Bemb. has *quendam misere*, which is the genuine Terence version. The 'Calliopian' editor wrote *miserum quendam*, introducing the easier *-rum* and transposing the words. These two modifications are in all the minuscule MSS. (Σ) of Terence—all except p^1 , which has *misere quendam*. Now p represents Δ . Δ recovered *-re* but retained the 'Calliopian' transposition. This means that Δ was using, and at the same time correcting from good sources, the corrupt text of 'Calliapius.' Any theory that Δ was an early text corrupted by 'Calliopian' readings falls to the ground.

My analysis of the grammarians' citations has not led to the discovery of any new Terence reading of first-rate importance.¹ That was to be expected. But I have endeavoured to show just what the grammarians' evidence is, and to convert the scholars who iterate the unproved statement that the grammarians' quotations demonstrate the existence of a variety of texts of Terence as early as the Byzantine Age. The burden of proof rests on those who maintain such early variety.

J. D. CRAIG.

THE UNIVERSITY, SHEFFIELD.

¹ Nothing like Housman's discovery of *attinet* for Ovid, *Her.* I. 2 (C.Q. XVI, 2, 88)—a certain reading which finally gets rid of an embarrassing *attamen* and restores our confidence in Penelope's womanliness and good sense. There is, however, an *attamen* in *Haut.* 225. Serv. Auct. (A. xii, 589) implies it by giving *satagit rerum suarum* as the Terentian parallel to Virgil's *trepidat rerum*.

In capitals SATAGITATTAMEN (so Cod. Bemb.) may be divided according to the fancy of the reader or copyist. Bentley plumped for *satagit tamen* on the strength of Charisius' statement, and, more especially, of Latin usage. But in *Haut.* 225 *attamen* means precisely 'yet at least.'

IOLAOS AND THE NINTH PYTHIAN ODE.

HAVING recently chosen to lecture on the Pythian Odes, and coming in due course to the ninth, I naturally consulted Dr. Farnell's translation and his article in the *Classical Quarterly* with regard to the puzzling question of the connexion in thought between lines 76-96 and the rest of the ode.¹ Being more or less dissatisfied both with his views and with those of such other commentators as were known to me,² I am now attempting to analyze the poem myself in hopes of showing that it is a more continuous whole than has been generally supposed.

That Pindar does on occasion use very abrupt transitions is of course a commonplace. One of the worst examples is Pyth. X. 31, where, having just said that no man can reach the Earthly Paradise (the land of the Hyperboreans), he proceeds to remark that Perseus did, and to give some particulars of what he saw there. Nor is this defect, or peculiarity, confined to his salad days, for it is, if anything, more conspicuous in the Eleventh Pythian (474), which drags in the story of Agamemnon's murder by the hair of its head, lines 15 sqq.; and it is not too easy to see the connexion between the praises of Hieron and the enigmatic remarks anent flatterers in the Second Pythian (about 475), lines 72 sqq. Yet I see no sufficient reason—and without sufficient reason it is a large assumption—for supposing so huge a gap between this passage and the rest of the poem as is necessary on Dr. Farnell's theory. The efforts of other writers to bridge the gap, or to prove that there is none, do not impress me very favourably.

It will make the situation clearer if I set down what is agreed as to the meaning of the poem. Pindar starts by saying, very briefly, that he has to celebrate the victory at Delphi, in the hoplite race, of Telesikrates the Cyrenaean. Cyrene was founded as a result of Apollo's love for the daughter of Hypseus; and here follows the legend of Apollo's wooing of the virgin huntress. Her city is famous for the athletic skill of its people (*καλλίσταν πόλιν ἀμφέπει κλεινὰν τ' ἀέθλοισι*, 70), as witness the success of Telesikrates, who will return in triumph to his native country, the land of fair women. So far no one has any doubt of the sense, which is perfectly plain and appropriate to the subject. Now follows the debatable passage, to which I will shortly return. At line 97 Telesikrates is again the subject, whatever the intervening verses may signify. He has won fame at certain (probably Athenian) contests, and in all those of his native country. Now follows a passage (lines 103-105) as nearly humorous as Pindar ever is; it seems to be his one and only joke (cf. Olymp. X. 1 sqq.) to pretend to have forgotten what he had agreed to write about. 'As I was fain to slake the thirst of my tired song,' he says,³ 'I was reminded that I have not

¹ *The Works of Pindar*, Vol. I. (Macmillan, 1930), p. 138; 'Pindar, Athens and Thebes,' in *C.Q.* IX. (1915), p. 193 sqq.

² I have before me, besides the editions of Gildersleeve, Christ, and Sandys, which give between them a critical account of the views of earlier commentators, Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Pindaros* (p. 263 sqq.); the Italian translation, with notes, by G. Fraccaroli (nuova edizione, Milan, 1914, Vol. II., p. 153 sqq.); and O. Schroeder's commentary (*Pindars Pythien*

erklärt von Otto Schroeder, Teubner, 1922, p. 85 sqq.).

³ So Farnell, rightly. It is a curiosity of criticism that this perfectly plain meaning and natural metaphor (the poet compares himself to a charioteer or other driver refreshing his tired team after a race or journey) has been so misunderstood by more than one scholar. Sandys renders it 'my thirst for song'; but a poet slaking his thirst for song would be composing, not ceasing to compose. Gildersleeve says 'the

mention
daughte
made th
ends, th
It
feeling
analyze

76-
is he w
(ποικίλ
δ' ἐν μα
me tha
raised
poets
Olymp
philosc
to taki
other
Gebörr
the pos
T

Pindar
connex
by find
to (so,
this.
he can
other
opport
a grea
and of
Alkm
be co
marry
remain
would
λέγειν
could
would
artist
gover
by th
'opp
(wor

poet f
muse
comp
interp
catch
διψῶσ
equal
mowi

mentioned Telesikrates' ancestors'; and he proceeds to tell of the winning of Antaios' daughter, curiously parenthesizing the story of the Danaids and how their father made them the prizes, and consolation prizes, of a foot-race. With this the ode ends, there being no final good advice, good wishes, or other *sententiae*.

It is evident that, if there is either any moralizing or any expression of personal feeling in the ode, it must lie between lines 76 and 96. I therefore proceed to analyze them at greater length. They run as follows:

76-78: great worthinesses are a fruitful theme for eloquence (*πολύμυθοι*), but it is he who can choose a small part of the abundant material and handle it cunningly (*ποικίλλειν*) who is really worth hearing by the judicious. So at least the words *βαυῖα* δ' ἐν μακροῖσι ποικίλλειν ἀκοᾷ σοφοῖς seem generally to be taken, and it seems to me that the sense thus obtained is far better than any other. The one difficulty raised by Wilamowitz (p. 264), that *σοφοί*, *σοφία*, generally refer to poetry and poets in Pindar, is not, I think, very serious; if he sings for the *συνετοί* in Olymp. II. 85 and uses *σοφία* to mean wisdom, in this case the wisdom which philosophers untimely seek after, in frag. 209 (cf. Olymp. IX. 38), I see no objection to taking him here to recommend himself to the judicious or skilful auditor. His other criticism of the usual interpretation, that *ἀκοᾷ*, being the 'Resonanz, die das Gehörte in der Seele der Hörenden findet,' cannot be identified with the activity of the poet, is rather too subtly logical to be of much weight in a lyrical passage.

The really difficult part of the ode now begins. Opportunity (*καιρός*), says Pindar, holds the crown or summit (*κορυφάν*) of everything alike. What is the connexion of this with what precedes or follows? Usually it is sought to explain it by finding examples of opportune or timely conduct in the myths related or alluded to (so, for instance, Mezger, approved by Gildersleeve). I confess that I cannot see this. Apollo can hardly be said to have seized an opportunity unlikely to recur when he carried off Cyrene. What was to prevent him from pressing his suit on some other occasion, for it is not said that she had other wooers? Iolaos did not grasp an opportunity offered to him in any rational sense of the phrase; he was confronted by a great emergency, the danger to the Herakleidai from Eurystheus, and he prayed for and obtained miraculous restoration to youth, or life, in order to help them. Neither Alkmene nor her twins could fairly be called opportunists. Alexidamos indeed may be considered to have regarded *καιρός* when he seized the chance given him of marrying Antaios' daughter; but it was rather his prowess as a runner than any remarkable prudence in judging the right moment that Pindar stresses. I therefore would return to the explanation of the scholiast, δὲ κατὰ καιρὸν καὶ μεγάλα καὶ μικρὰ λέγειν, except for his faulty interpretation of *βαυῖα ἐν μακροῖς*. Anyone, Pindar means, could talk at great length on so fertile a theme as Telesikrates' prowess; but he who would please a discerning hearer must choose and restrict his theme, handle it artistically, and choose the right time and place for his utterance. Opportuneness governs all, and therefore governs poetry too. I am confirmed in this interpretation by the use of *καιρός* in Nem. I. 18, πολλῶν ἐπέβαν καιρὸν οὐ ψεύδει βαλὼν, where the 'opportunity' is the one which Pindar himself has seized, an 'occasion for many (words),' literally, 'the very heart of a manifold theme' in Dr. Farnell's rendering.

What opportune utterances, then, does Pindar make, and what does he select

poet finds that he is quenching the thirst of his muse'—i.e., I suppose, that he is satiated with composition; a most strained and unnatural interpretation. Hermann, followed by Christ, catches at the scholiast's stupid paraphrase *διψῶσαν ψῆδην*, and introduces into the text an equally stupid emendation, *δοῦδαν διψᾶδ*. Wilamowitz (p. 266) renders the passage 'es mahnt

mich jemand an die Verpflichtung, seinen Durst nach Liedern zu stillen.' Schroeder is at least ingenious in supposing that *τις* means, not some person, Telesikrates or a friend, but one of the 'songs' or stories themselves which 'thirsts' to be told; but I see no reason for taking the passage in this way, although it is not an impossibility in Pindar.

from the material which he says is so abundant? If anything is agreed among the commentators on this ode, it is that some conjecture must be indulged in if we are to make it fully intelligible. I make but a modest one, far less romantic than the tales of wronged Theban virgins and forthcoming marriages in Cyrene or elsewhere which some have woven out of the text. I suppose, firstly, that Telesikrates had come to Greece to take part in several athletic festivals, having already distinguished himself at home as a first-rate runner. In fact, I see in him a more modest predecessor of the *περιοδονῆκαι* of Imperial times. Of the Great Games only the Pythia were available, unless he stayed more than a year,¹ and therefore he had entered only for that; but there were several minor festivals at which he could and did distinguish himself. Of these Pindar picks out those of which he can find most to say, which it is possible *ποιεῖν* without becoming tedious. Catalogues of minor events were never to his liking,² and he cuts them short whenever he can; but some mention of them seems to have been regarded as inevitable—in fact, part of what the victor expected for his money. It would be very strange if Telesikrates had had no such victories to his credit or had not wanted them recorded. To this I take Pindar to allude in this passage. He will shorten the tedious catalogue by mentioning those events which have an interest in themselves, and the first of these, as I hold, following once more an ancient interpretation, was at the Iolaeia.³ I would construe lines 79-80 thus: 'and seven-gated Thebes one day learned that Iolaos had treated him (Telesikrates) with great honour.' That is, I make *νῦν* the object of *ἀτιμάσαντα*, not its quasi-subject; but I understand it to refer to Telesikrates, not to *καιρός*. This may be considered harsh, but I cannot agree with those who think it impossible. Pindar has mentioned the victor by name, or rather by calling him the son of his father, nine lines earlier (71), and then referred to him again by a pronoun in line 73. This surely is no more difficult to understand than, for instance, the *ἀμφέπει* of line 70, the subject of which is Cyrene, not mentioned by name for a long time, nor made the subject or object of any verb since line 59; for the *μῖγεν* of line 68 does not define whether it is Apollo or Cyrene who is warden of the city, and to make it harsher, in formal grammar at least, the name of Libya has intervened in line 69. As to the validity of his choice, he at least thought the Iolaeia important, and so, it would seem, did Hieron of Syracuse, to judge by the Second Pythian; moreover, he goes on to justify himself. The language is by no means without parallel; Iolaos has done Telesikrates honour, as Apollo 'beheld and gave glory to' Xenokrates of Akragas.⁴

What, then, is the point of the glorification of Theban heroes and of Thebes which now follows? That it is a deliberate apologia, either for Pindar's former praises of Athens (Farnell) or for his long stay in the courts of Sicilian tyrants (Wilamowitz), I do not believe; that would be at once too alien to the general subject and too obscure. We know by a certain example how Pindar did defend himself when he had occasion to do so; the Seventh Nemean is notoriously his apologia for the Sixth Paean. Now in that ode the subject of Neoptolemos and Delphi is most naturally introduced; he is celebrating the victory of an Aeginetan, and it would hardly be possible to avoid some mention of the Aiakidai. He therefore tells the story of Neoptolemos, and vehemently denies that he had ever libelled so great a hero. But in this ode, addressed to a Cyrenaean, who probably did not care in the least whether Pindar had overpraised Athens (or been too fond of Sicilian tyrants) or not, what occasion, other than one most artificially made, could there be for such a defence? If Pindar had wanted to defend himself, why not wait until a

¹ See E. N. Gardner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, p. 68.

² See especially Olymp. XIII. 113, with the good comments of Wilamowitz, *Pindaros*, p. 369

sqq.

³ Schol. on line 89 (156): *δηλαδὴ καὶ τὰ Ἰολαεῖα ἐνίκησεν ὁ νικηφόρος*. The note on 137 takes *νῦν* to refer to *καιρός*.

⁴ Isthm. II. 18.

commission for an ode of some kind came from nearer home? He may indeed have had at the back of his mind the strictures of those who thought him no true Theban in sentiment; but I hold that he had in view in these lines an object much more germane to the ostensible purpose for which the poem is written—the praises of Telesikrates.

'He gained, among other victories, one at the Iolaeia,' says the poet; and now he has to justify himself for choosing that particular success to head the list, next after the celebration of the Pythian victory and the glorification of the victor's home and its mythical foundress. Hence, as I take it, a long parenthesis: 'And what a hero Iolaos was, and how worthy are his favours! Noble, indeed, are all our Theban heroes, Herakles and the rest; I have sung their praises ere now, and if the Charites will continue to favour me, I shall again sing my song of thanksgiving to the immortal guardians of Thebes, and to none other.' I agree with those who take πόλιν τάνδ' in line 91 as referring to Thebes, and also with those who refuse to alter or misconstrue φηγών in line 92 in order to get a reference to further successes of Telesikrates; the argument of Fraccaroli that Pindar cannot be referring to himself because 'l'opera Pindaro la pone di regola in antitesi col canto' seems to me to have no force; we have the familiar antithesis of λόγῳ and ἔργῳ implied, and the meaning is that he has showed himself a poet, not by arguing to that effect, but simply by writing good poetry. I also regard the words Χαρίτων . . . φέγγος in lines 89-91 as explaining and giving the content of the 'prayer' just mentioned, which was rather for his own continued inspiration than for the success of any foreigner in a Theban contest.

And now come the most hotly disputed words of all, the citation (ll. 94-96) of the precept of Nereus to praise even an enemy if he deserves it. As it is necessary to discuss it in somewhat minute detail, I cite the text in full:

οὔνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀστών, εἰ τις ἀντάεις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεπονημένον εὖ
μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἀλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω.
κείνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἔχθρῳ
παντὶ θυμῷ σὺν γε δίκᾳ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἐννεπεν.

One of the strongest seeming arguments in favour of Dr. Farnell's interpretation is furnished by the first word. 'Because I have shown myself a good Theban by my praise of Thebes, *therefore* let all other (Theban) citizens, friends or foes (to Athens?), remember the precept to praise even a deserving enemy.' He further lays stress upon ἐν ξυνῷ. 'A Cyrenaean's victory,' he says, 'was only κοινός to his kinsmen and fellow-citizens, not κοινός in general' (p. 196). This last point I do not think weighty. 'Common' or 'general' is a relative term, and it must be defined to whom the matter in question is 'common.' This Pindar has done by the word ἀστών, or so it seems to me; certain citizens are to take a generous view of something done for their common good. There need be no question of any Panhellenic deeds, whether of an individual or a city. It remains to consider how else we may take the words than as suggested by Dr. Farnell. If οὔνεκεν does not refer to what immediately precedes, i.e., if the reason for the generous attitude suggested is not to be found in Pindar's praise of Thebes on some unknown occasions, to what does it refer? I feel, and many re-readings of the passage do but confirm the feeling, that it goes back to line 80. 'Because Telesikrates has done gloriously at the Iolaeia (and elsewhere, notably at the Pythian Games), let his fellow-citizens take a generous attitude towards him.' The sudden outburst of praise to the Theban heroes I would take as a parenthesis, and not the only one in Pindar; compare for instance Olymp. VII. 32-77, in which the myths of Helios' acquisition of Rhodes and of the birth of Athena are thrust into the middle of Apollo's advice to Tlepolemos. Here the necessity for making this rather distant connexion of reason and precept seems to me occasioned

by the fact that only so can we get really satisfactory sense out of what follows. Certain 'citizens' are divided into friends and foes of someone, and the division is not merely a variant of that favourite way of saying 'every one' illustrated by Soph. *Antig.* 1109, but to be taken literally, as is shown by what follows. All, friends and foes, but especially the latter, are exhorted to give just praise to one who has done well in the common cause, by acknowledging his worth. Now I do not see how this can apply to Pindar and the aspersions which had been made against his patriotism for his praise of Athens (or his sojourn in Sicily). For what Pindar was suspected of was not adherence to this or that party in Thebes; what pro-Athenian faction was there at that date or any other until after the Peloponnesian War? If we are to believe the story of his unpopularity at all, it was, for the time being, universal in his own city; the Ambrosian Life, Eustathios and Thomas Magister, all clearly going back to one source, say the Thebans, i.e., their government, fined him, and the fine was paid, not by anyone in Thebes, but by Athens. The mention of the same story by the pseudo-Aischines, *Ep.* 4, 3, indicates that it belongs to a respectable tradition; Pausanias also perhaps knows of it,¹ and Isokrates XV. 166 might be taken as referring to it. It may, then, be true; and if so, we would naturally suppose that all, or the great majority, of his fellow-citizens were his ἀνταίετες for the time being. But in Telesikrates we have a citizen of a state concerning which we know little that fits with the date of the poem, but at least this much, that it had a long and unlovely history of faction and internal strife. Pindar himself, not very long after, made the acquaintance of a banished citizen of Cyrene, Damophilos, in whose interests he wrote the Fourth Pythian; he may very well have learned that Telesikrates, or his family, had powerful enemies, and wished to say a word in his favour, and still more on behalf of what he had always at heart, internal peace in a Greek city.²

But it may be, and has been objected that his message, if to Cyrenaeans, was out of place in an ode which in all probability was sung in Thebes.³ This would be a serious difficulty to any such theory as that which I support if it were certain, or likely, that this was to be the public's only opportunity of hearing what Pindar had to say on the matter; but that no other opportunities existed I do not for a moment believe. I pass over the possibility of a second performance of the ode at Cyrene, thinking rather of the actual publication of the text of odes in the poet's own lifetime. We know, of course, that the collected edition was made by the Alexandrians; but for the publication of single pieces we have the authority, not only of Plato, who makes old Kephalos refer to a Pindaric passage as a thing which every tolerably educated man would know as a matter of course⁴; not only of Aristophanes, who expects his miscellaneous audience to catch a parody of Pindar⁵; not only of Herodotus, who cites him as a familiar author⁶; but of Pindar himself, who practically tells Xenokrates of Akragas not to let local prejudices prevent him publishing the odes (or ode, if τοῦσδ' ὕμνους be taken as a rhetorical plural) written in his honour.⁷ The reading public of those days was no doubt small, and the number of available books not great; but that there was a reading public, and what is equally important, a public which had by heart and discussed no small amount of literature, especially in verse, seems to me certain enough. If that is so, then it can have made very little difference whether the performance, even if it was the only one, of the ode in public

¹ I. 8, 4. He does not actually mention the story of the fine.

² See, for praise of quiet and dispraise of faction, *Olymp.* XII. 16; *Pyth.* VIII. 1; *Nem.* IX. 29; *Paean* IX. 15; frag. 106 (228).

³ The arguments, which seem to put the matter beyond reasonable doubt, are marshalled by Farnell, *C.Q.* IX., p. 197.

⁴ Plato, *Rep.* I. 331A. Kephalos of course was

a younger contemporary of Pindar himself. I need not mention the other Pindaric citations in Plato, which are fairly numerous.

⁵ See *Knights* 1264, *Birds* 926; the second of these, being at the City Dionysia, had not Aristophanes' own favourite audience, composed of sharp-witted Athenians only, but a composite one.

⁶ *Hdt.* III. 38, 4.

⁷ *Isthm.* II. 45.

with a f
would ha
thought.

It
way in v
be taken
athletic
the natu
the rule
to brack
at least
'to prai
praise,
further l
have see
of the g

So,
conjectu
sentimen
whether
rear up

The
settlers
the othe
number
they ma
a 'great
at least
the cou
between
divided
settlers'
Pelopor
Phereti
unity.
guess, t
perhaps
If this
all stor
Antaios
digress
an obsc
a Berbo
after al
was lea
prove a

Sr.

¹ Farn

² It w

Farnell's

³ Hdt.

with a full choir took place at Thebes or Cyrene; the citizens of the latter place would have opportunity enough of making themselves acquainted with what Pindar thought.

It remains to ask what exactly he did think, and this depends on the precise way in which we construe line 96, especially the words *σύν γε δίκῃ*. If these are to be taken closely with *καλὰ ῥέζοντ'*, then Dr. Farnell's argument holds good; an athletic feat can hardly be called an act of justice,¹ unless indeed we so far contort the natural sense as to take it as referring to the athlete's scrupulous observance of the rules of the meet. But why should we take it so, when there is no article to bracket it with the participle, as there is in the case of *ἐν ξυνῷ* just above? To me at least it seems to make very good sense if we take it with the preceding verb *αἰνεῖν*, 'to praise even an enemy with our whole heart, provided (*γε*) there be justice in the praise, (namely) when that enemy is doing nobly.' This leads naturally to the further laudation of Telesikrates: 'nobly he has done,' Pindar says, 'for my own eyes have seen him winning honour and love at no less a place than Athens, to say nothing of the games in his own land.'²

So, then, I would interpret this doubtful and difficult passage. It involves conjecturing that Telesikrates had enemies in Cyrene, but nothing beyond that; the sentiment would be appropriate whether their dislike was for his person or his family, whether it was private or political. But, if I may build a castle in the air, I would rear up its battlements as follows:

There can have been little love lost, as it seems to me, between the original settlers and their descendants on the one hand and the later arrivals from Greece on the other. The former, Battos I.'s original subjects and comrades,³ were but few in number, and it is plain, both from Herodotus and from the story Pindar tells, that they married Berber women. The latter, those whom Battos II. invited, were a 'great company,'⁴ and may be supposed to have brought their women with them, at least in most cases. The constitution of Demonax, if anything was left of it after the counter-revolution engineered by Pheretime, would do little to soften the feeling between the mixed bloods and the pure, or comparatively pure, Greeks, for he divided the people into 'Theraeans and perioikoi' (which surely means original settlers' descendants and Libyans, if it means anything), Dorians from Crete and the Peloponnesos, and islanders other than Cretans.⁵ Nor would the hideous cruelty of Pheretime herself do much to make Greeks and semi-barbarians dwell together in unity. I suggest, then, not forgetting that it is nothing but a more or less intelligent guess, that Telesikrates, one of the mixed bloods, found himself and his fellows, perhaps especially his own family, in bad odour with the majority of the citizen body. If this is so, I can at least fancy a reason for the choice of myths. They are all stories of marriage (Apollo-Cyrene, Zeus-Alkmene, Alexidamos—daughter of Antaios), the others (Iolaos and the Danaids) being mere parentheses or explanatory digressions. Now all these marriages were, so to say, mixed: the great Apollo weds an obscure nymph; Zeus himself unites with a mortal woman; Alexidamos' bride is a Berber. In all these cases, says Pindar, the inferior partner was none so unworthy after all. Cyrene bore Aristaos, Alkmene Herakles. Antaios was no savage, for he was learned in the lore of Greece; why should not his daughter's descendants likewise prove as good as those of the purest stock?

H. J. ROSE.

ST. ANDREWS.

¹ Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

² It will be seen that I agree here with Dr. Farnell's interpretation.

³ Hdt. IV. 159; 186, 2. See the various com-

mentators and modern historians for discussion.

⁴ *Ibid.* 159. 4.

⁵ Demonax, *ibid.* 161; Pheretime, *ibid.* 165 sqq., 200 sqq.

NOTE BY DR. L. R. FARNELL.

My friend Professor Rose has kindly sent me his paper containing a new interpretation of the famous passage in Pindar, Pyth. IX. 78-96, and controverting an interpretation that I had put forth in the *Classical Quarterly*, 1915; he also invites me to publish simultaneously with it any criticisms which I may have to make of his arguments. I have read and re-read his statement with great care, and at first reading was almost convinced, and felt that I must re-write my own notes on the passage in my second volume, which were already finished for the press. I am in agreement with much of his exposition; but further reflection reveals to me certain flaws in his theory which prevent me accepting it. I will state them *seriatim*:

Lines 79-80 ἔγνω . . . Θῆβαι: Professor Rose revives the old interpretation that these words refer to a victory won by Telesikrates in the Iolaia, expressed by the allusive words, 'Thebes learned that Iolaos did not despise him.' I admit at once that such a vague periphrasis for a special victory is possible for Pindar. He quotes as a parallel Isthm. II. 18, and he might have quoted Nem. IV. 19; this indeed is vaguer than either of these parallels, but Pindar loves far-fetched expressions in place of the dry record of athletic events. But two reasons work in my mind strongly against this version: (a) as three sentences containing several nouns have preceded this sentence since Pindar last mentioned the athlete, I feel sure that when he wishes to mention him again he would not think such a faint sign as *νιν*—a mere shadow-word—sufficient to designate him by. Professor Rose quotes a parallel passage showing, he thinks, an equally harsh and remote reference in *νιν*, l. 71—ἐν Πυθωνί *νιν*—but surely the *νιν* here is Libya, the subject of the sentence immediately preceding, as commentators have generally perceived. It is a good rule to explain *e proximo*, and according to this rule the *νιν* in our sentence ought to be *καίρος*; and while I agree with Professor Rose that the other myths in the ode carry no conceivable illustration of the *καίρος*-aphorism, I think he has missed the appropriateness of the Iolaos-story as an example of it: it was at a great crisis when Iolaos came forth from the dead to aid the children of Herakles; Iolaos heard and recognized the call of *καίρος*, as Barbarossa will in Heine's brilliant poem:

'Doch, wenn die rechte Stunde kommt,
Wird er empor sich rütteln.'

(b) My other difficulty is simply the particle *πότε*, which the newly offered interpretation takes no note of: it certainly suggests something that happened long ago. But Telesikrates' victory in the Iolaia must be presumed to be recent, as he is not likely to have been many years in Greece.

Then, as Professor Rose's exposition proceeds, Pindar, having mentioned the athlete's victory in the Iolaia, wishes to increase its prestige by telling some notable story concerning Iolaos. This is good Pindaric method. But why, when there were so many thrilling stories concerning the prowess of this hero, the warrior-comrade of Herakles, does Pindar select one which had been very rarely told, and which he is not known to have even mentioned again? I think we must reckon seriously with the fact, which chiefly set me on the trail of my own theory, that this is the only legend in Greek mythology showing Thebes and Athens fighting on the same battlefield as friends. His Theban audience could hardly help thinking of Athens at this moment.

Again, I do not find his theory relevant to explain the vehement passion that throbs in the lines 87-91; and he is obliged to go outside his own theory here, and to admit that Pindar is here moved by some personal fears as to his own reputation with the Thebans. But that fear was twofold, concerned with the charges not only of coldness towards Thebes, but also of disloyal attachment to Athens. In any case

it is that
φυγών, w
πόλιν τάν

Another
theory P
to be gen
had man
each oth
who gru
rule of i
away fro
latter m
Pindar is
an enem
who was
Iolaos st
as καλὰ

This
his inter
clash, is
the unne
these wo
words σ
grammar
rhythm
καλὰ βέ
because
enemy
praise w
to αἰνεῖν
win a vi
Athens
of Persi

Pro
breaking
prove th
reason l
allusion
been ex
to the d
the very
make h
mission
on Prof
treats l
away fr
gives s
also co
the abr
theory,
athlete
own pe

it is that fear, and not the victories of Telesikrates, that explains lines 90-93 Αἰγίνα . . . φυγών, where Professor Rose shows his usual sense of scholarship in insisting that πόλιν τάνδε must be Thebes and in refusing impertinent emendations.

Another grave difficulty arises in line 93 εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἰ τις ἀνταίε: on his theory Pindar is here appealing to the Cyrenaeans, possible enemies of Telesikrates, to be generous to the athlete who has won glory. This hypothesis, that Telesikrates had many enemies in Cyrene, is quite legitimate—probably most Cyrenaeans hated each other—and Pindar elsewhere deprecates the φθόνος and μῶμος of the citizens, who grudge the successful athlete his proper meed of praise. But here again the rule of interpretation *e proximo* is strongly against this view. ἀστῶν stands very far away from any mention of Telesikrates or Cyrene, and very near to πόλιν τάνδε: the latter means Thebes, as we are now agreed, therefore ἀστῶν means Thebans; and Pindar is pleading, not with Cyrenaeans, but with Thebans, to be generous in judging an enemy. Who is the enemy? Not Pindar, as I have shown elsewhere, but one who was in everyone's mind and whom it was tactful not to mention—one whom the Iolaos story would at once remind them of, and one whom Pindar dares to describe as καλὰ ῥέζοντα σὺν δίκῃ.

This brings on the last question at issue. Professor Rose frankly admits that his interpretation, with which the strong words τό γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεπονημένον εἶ do not clash, is overthrown if we must take the words σὺν τε δίκῃ (he need not have accepted the unnecessary emendation γε for τε) with καλὰ ῥέζοντα, for he admits rightly that these words could not apply to an athlete's performance. But he maintains that the words σὺν δίκῃ can just as well go with αἰνεῖν as with ῥέζοντα. To this I must demur: grammatically they can, but they do not go 'just as well' from the point of view of rhythm and moral logic—of rhythm, because all the words between τὸν ἐχθρόν and καλὰ ῥέζοντα ought to belong to the same phrase with τὸν ἐχθρόν; of moral logic, because it is difficult enough to extort praise from the average man even when his enemy has acted in every way perfectly: he is not likely to praise him unless the praise would be at least just: therefore the words σὺν δίκῃ are entirely otiose if applied to αἰνεῖν, most valuable—even necessary—when added to καλὰ ῥέζοντα: it is καλόν to win a victory, but the victor does not always act with justice; it was καλὸν ῥέζειν of Athens to free the maritime Greeks and to help free the mainland from the yoke of Persia; and it was also σὺν δίκῃ and in the highest sense ἐν ξυνῷ πεπονημένον εἶ.

Professor Rose's original objection to this interpretation is that it is irrelevant, breaking the unity of the ode, also that it is obscure. But neither of these charges prove that it is not true, for Pindar is often obscure in his allusions (he had very good reason here for avoiding the hated name of Athens) and very often irrelevant. The allusion need not have been obscure for the Thebans if the bitterness had recently been excited by the Dithyramb on Athens (which we have reason to think was near to the date of this ode): the danger would be great enough to compel Pindar to take the very next occasion of a public poem composed by him for recitation in Thebes to make his defence; he would not wait till a Theban had won a victory and commissioned him. As regards irrelevance, it is no disproof; there is some irrelevance on Professor Rose's theory, though less—I admit—than on mine. But Pindar always treats his athletes with a very free hand, and is capable at any moment of breaking away from them into a personal digression when he is worked up. Professor Rose gives some salient examples much more violent and inexplicable than this: let him also consider from the point of obscurity and irrelevance Nem. IV., ll. 35-43, and for the abruptness of the personal digression Pyth. XI. 50. And after all, even on my theory, Pindar treats this Telesikrates much better than he treats most of his athlete-patrons, and gives him his money's worth in full. Nor is the transition to his own personal affair unskillfully managed, if we may state Pindar's thought, when he

begins his moralizing βαλὲ δ' ἐν μακροῖσι, somewhat as this: 'I might say a great deal more about the merits of Telesikrates, but wise judges prefer the half to the whole: it is always a question of *καιρός*, the right thing to do or say at the right moment (it is now my *καιρός* for speaking about something else on my mind). Our great hero, Iolaos, understood what *καιρός* was,' etc.

Professor Rose's interpretation is saner and more logical than any I have seen put forward by other scholars. If I still prefer my own, it is not because I am personally biased in its favour, but because it seems to me to agree better with the Greek at the points on which I have dwelt, and better also with the tense and passionate excitement of the passage about Herakles Dirke and Thebes—one of his masterpieces; and the significance I would attach to lines 93-96 allows us to regard them as a very noble contribution to Greek ethical poetry. The question, therefore, is one of great importance; and we shall each of us be glad to receive and to profit by the verdict of scholars on these differing interpretations.

LEWIS R. FARNELL.

great deal
the whole :
moment (it
great hero,

have seen
ause I am
r with the
tense and
one of his
to regard
therefore,
d to profit

RNELL.

ADDENDUM.

Iolaos and the Ninth Pythian Ode. Note by Dr. L. R. Farnell, p. 164.

My view that *νιν* is *καιρόν*, as against Professor Rose's view (which is also Schroeder's) that it = *Τελεσικράτη*, is further supported by a passage in a later ode, *Pyth.* IV. 286-287 ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς . . . εἶ νιν ἔγνωκεν: here again a general aphorism about *καιρὸς* is followed by a special statement about it containing *νιν* = *καιρόν*, and the later passage sounds like an echo of the earlier.

Pr
pp. 38-4
idioms
clearly
Short, I
Mr. An
citation
do. I
particul

appareo:
33-
editissim
28.
efficio w
3-
40.
egeo wit
3-
egredior
Cu

mo
emineo l
emptor (
eruditiss
excuso in
exhorres
tri
exitus v
Su
exorabil
ma
exordium
An
exorno
26
experior
22
expono.
exsecro
9-
gloriosu
gratulor
grauiter
24

MORE LIVY NOT IN THE *LEXICA*.

PROFESSOR W. B. ANDERSON'S paper 'Livy and the *Lexica*' in *C.Q.* XXV., 1931, pp. 38-48, prompts me to put together from my notes this further list of words and idioms used by Livy but not recorded in the *lexica* as Livian. With one or two clearly indicated exceptions, I have included nothing which is given in Lewis and Short, Forcellini-Corradini-Perin or Georges, and I have included nothing in which Mr. Anderson has anticipated me, except that in a few places I have added to the citations he gives; but my citations make no more claim to be exhaustive than his do. I have given within parentheses the authors who are cited by the *lexica* for a particular word or use, but I have refrained from adding other authorities.

- appareo*: *apparet* with indir. interrog. cl. To Mr. Anderson's 27. 18. 2.; 28. 24. 2.; 33. 37. 8 and 36. 30. 5 add 42. 43. 5.
- editissimus* (Sall. auct. bell. Alex. Col. Just. Vopiscus). To Mr. Anderson's 7. 24. 8; 28. 16. 7 and 28. 20. 2 add 38. 19. 3.
- efficio* with predicate (Cic. Caes. Sall. Ov. Phaedr.): praef. 5; 1. 6. 2; 2. 60. 4; 3. 65. 11; 6. 6. 9; 6. 23. 11; 24. 5. 2; 25. 10. 4; 27. 31. 5; 31. 40. 8; 39. 51. 6; 40. 13. 6; 41. 24. 18; 44. 37. 11; 45. 7. 3; 45. 11. 4.
- egeo* with genitive (Plaut. Lucr. Caes. Sall. Hor. Prop. Ov. Quint. Tac.): 3. 28. 10; 3. 52. 9; 22. 31. 3.
- egredior* with ablative otherwise than in the phrase *egredi navi* (Cic. Caes. Sall. Vell. Curt. Tac. Suet.): 3. 60. 8; 9. 29. 5; 23. 11. 4; 35. 4. 4; 43. 18. 1.
Lit. with *a* (Suet.): 10. 43. 13; 24. 40. 11; 27. 17. 8.
Fig. with accusative (Vell. Sen. Val. Flacc. Quint. Tac. Fronto): 2. 61. 4
modum dumtaxat in certamine egressum.
- emineo* lit. with *a* (Caes. Plin. N.H.): 21. 55. 7 *elephanti eminentes ab extremis cornibus*.
- emptor* (Plaut. Cic. Sall. Hor. Flor. Juv. Suet.): 26. 11. 7.
- eruditissimus* (Cic. Quint.): 39. 8. 3.
- excuso* in passive with infinitive (Cic.). To Georges' 3. 13. 9 and 43. 2. 10 add 43. 4. 6.
- exhorresco* with accusative (Virg. Val. Max. Val. Flacc. Sil. Suet. Vulg.): 8. 35. 11 *ni tristitia edicta exhorruisset*.
- exitus* without *vitalis* meaning 'death' (Cic. Ov. Sen. Petr. Plin. N.H. Plin. min. Juv. Suet. Amm.): 6. 18. 9; 6. 20. 14 *hunc exitum habuit*.
- exorabilis* (Plaut. Cic. Hor. Sen. Sil. Tac. Juv. Suet.): 25. 16. 12 *nullam unquam gentem magis exorabilem*; 34. 1. 7.
- exordium* in general sense (sing. Enn. Cic. Plin. N.H. Quint. Suet. Lact. Pallad. Eutr. Amm.: plur. Lucr. Virg.): 1. 38. 6 *muro cuius exordium turbatum erat*.
- exorno* lit. 'beautify' (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Sall. Curt. Sen. Just. Lact.): 26. 11. 9; 26. 31. 9; 41. 20. 9.
- expior*. *expertus* with accusative and infinitive (Plaut. Caes. Sall. Quint. Plin. min.): 22. 35. 3.
- expono*. *exposito* abl. abs. (Caes. Curt.): 44. 35. 13 *exposito quid pararet*.
- exsecror* with accusative (Cic. Sall. Ov. Virg. Val. Max. Just. Dig.): 5. 11. 15
9. 5. 13; 40. 10. 1.
- gloriosus*, 'glorious' (Cic. Sall. Nep. Vell. Phaedr. Tac. Suet. Just. Vulg.): 23. 42. 7.
- gratulor* with accusative and infinitive (Cic. Ov. Val. Max. Just.): 21. 50. 8.
- graviter* lit. 'heavily' (Lucr. Caes. Virg. Ov. 'very rare' say Lewis and Short): 24. 34. 14.

- gurgis* fig. (Cic. Val. Max. Gell. Prud. Amm.): 39. 16. 5 *si quem libido, si furor in illum gurgitem abripuit*.
- habeo. sibi habere aliquid* (Cic. Sall. Quint.): 9. 11. 8; 26. 50. 12.
- haereo* with *ad* (Cic. Catull. Val. Flacc.): 38. 49. 10.
- illecebra* in plur. without genitive (Cic. Hor.): 2. 51. 5.
- impedimentum* with *quominus* (Plin. Epp. VI. 28. 1): 39. 39. 7 *ne impedimento esset quominus comitia haberentur*.
- impedio* with *ne* (Cic. Sall. Nep.). To Georges' 6. 31. 2 and 41. 15. 9 add 7. 17. 7; 38. 32. 1; 39. 39. 14.
- impero. imperato* abl. abs. 35. 35. 14 *imperato quod res poposcisset*.
- impetus. impetum addere*, 'stimulate': 2. 45. 7.
- impono* with *supra* (Ter. Hor. Ov. Quint. Dig., with *super* Ov. Curt. Plin. N.H., with *insuper* Virg. Livy): 42. 42. 6.
- improvisus. ex improviso* (Plaut. Cic.): 8. 10. 5; 10. 14. 15; 10. 24. 13; 23. 37. 6; 25. 9. 11; 31. 26. 3; 31. 37. 4; 34. 14. 11; 40. 47. 2.
- improviso* (Plaut. Lucil. Cic. Caes. Virg.). To Georges' 29. 32. 2 add 6. 33. 7; 10. 32. 8; 44. 35. 11.
- impudens* of things (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Quint. Fronto): 39. 28. 11 *calumniae impudentissimae*.
- incertus* with *de* (Plin. Epp. VI. 20. 10): 9. 6. 4 *incerti de fide sociorum. ex incerto* 9. 24. 8 *quae omnia ex incerto maiora teritis ostentat. ex incertissimo* 6. 23. 3 *multitudinis ex incertissimo summentis animos*.
- indico. ex ante indicto* 33. 28. 4.
- indo* lit. with dative (Plaut. Cato Curt. Sen. Plin. N.H. Tac. Flor. Suet. Gell.): *scintillam leuem ignis inditam plumae*.
- inferus. infimum* (Plaut. Caes. Sen.): 1. 9. 3 *ex infimo nasci*.
- ingigno. ingenitus* (Cic. Curt. Sen. Col. Plin. N.H. Quint. Tac. Plin. min. Suet. Tert. Amm.). To Mr. Anderson's 1. 34. 5; 4. 30. 7; 8. 7. 18; 41. 18. 3 add 9. 6. 5.
- initor* fig. (Cic. Quint. Tac. Plin. min.). To Georges' 4. 28. 7 add 6. 1. 4.
- inops* with ablative (Cic.): 21. 50. 3.
- insignis* with *ad* (Cic.): 1. 47. 12; 7. 28. 9; 24. 49. 8.
- insons* in plur. as noun (Sall.): 2. 54. 10 *adeoque neminem noxiae paenitebat, ut etiam insontes fecisse uideri uellent*.
- instrumentum* lit. in plur. (Caes. Ov. Sen. Col. Apul. Just.): 21. 30. 9 *instrumenta belli*; fr. perhaps from 91.
- integer. ab integro* (Cato Cic. Virg.): 43. 16. 7.
- intendo*, 'intend,' with accusative (Ter. Cic. Sall.): 3. 11. 2 *manu obtinendum erat quod intenderes*; 33. 38. 3.
- inter* repeated (Cic. Virg. Hor. Tib. Prop. Val. Flacc. Sil. Claud.): 10. 7. 1. With gerundive (Plaut. Suet.). To Mr. Anderson's 2. 20. 9; 6. 11. 5; 6. 39. 10; 9. 11. 6; 34. 25. 6; 40. 42. 1 add 7. 40. 5. With *quae* (Cels. Curt. Tac. Suet.): 23. 35. 7.
- intercedo* with *quin* 24. 13. 3.
- intersum. interest* with *ut* (Cic. Caes. Plin. min. Vopiscus): 40. 34. 10.
- intexo* fig. (Cic. auct. Ciris. Tib. Petr. Tert.): 7. 2. 11 *ridicula intexta uersibus*.
- introduco* with *ad* (Curt. ad regem): *ad senatum* 3. 4. 6 and 5. 27. 12.
- introeo* impers. (Cato Varro Sall.): 26. 21. 10.
- inuidiosus. inuidiosum est* with accusative and infinitive (Sen. rhet.): 3. 9. 12 *inuidiosum nobis est desertam rem publicam inuadi*.
- laetor* with accusative (Cic. Sall. auct. Cul. Ov.; with passive Sall. Stat. Fronto Claud. Augustine): 45. 13. 7 *id laetari*.

latus. ex lateribus (Sall. auct. bell. Alex.): 44. 9. 9. *in fronte extremi et ex lateribus soli non habebant super capita elata scuta.*

levis with dative of gerundive: 28. 44. 5 *leuissima fidei mutandae ingenia.*

licet with, or without, accusative, and passive infin. (Cic.): 3. 11. 8; 4. 16. 6; 7. 42. 2; 8. 12. 16; 10. 13. 8; 27. 34. 9; 39. 32. 7.

longe. longius, of time (Plaut. Cic. Caes. Sall. Nep. Hor. Quint.): 22. 61. 6.

longinquus. ex longinquo, 'from afar' (Sen. Plin. N.H. Tac.): 34. 34. 6.

magis. unus maxime (Nep. Curt.): 3. 16. 5; 22. 22. 8; 26. 41. 11.

cum maxime (Cato Ter. Sen. Tac.): 29. 17. 20 *omnia, quae captae urbes patiuntur, passi sumus et cum maxime patimur.*

magnus. maior aetate (Quint. and, of time in history, Sen.): 28. 21. 7.

malo with subjunctive (Cic. *Epp. ad fam.* VII. 14. 2. Catull. Tib. Sen. rhet. Quint. Juv. Calp.): 22. 39. 20; 22. 49. 4.

mare. mari ac terra (Flor.; with *atque* Sall., with *et* Nep.): 24. 40. 4.

maturus with *ad* (Sil.): 36. 12. 11 *tempus anni maturum ad nauigandum.*

mediocris of size (Caes. Hirt. Varro Sall. Suet. Just.): 7. 12. 3 *mediocrem multitudinem.*

meditor. meditatus (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Ov. Plin. N.H. Tac. Suet. Plin. min. Gell.): 40. 15. 13; 42. 52. 3.

mitis with *aduersus*: 33. 12. 9.

moderatus of persons (Cic. Capitol.): 27. 34. 3; 30. 40. 8.

of things (Sall. Cic. Ov. Vell.): 24. 22. 1.

modo. Lewis and Short and Georges conceal the fact that Latin writers sometimes use *modo* with the force of *postmodo*, of which use Forcellini-De Vit gives as one of three examples Livy 26. 15. 13. The variants at 38. 56. 6 are possibly worth noticing, and see Professor Housman's note on Manilius I. 871 (regrettably ignored by Mr. J. Tate in *C.R.* XXXIX., 1925, p. 71) and also Manilius V, p. 134.

mollis of a slope (Caes. Virg. Ov. Curt. Stat. Quint. Tac.): 27. 18. 15.

moneo with subjunctive (Cic. Sen. Stat.): 3. 12. 6.

morior of abstracts (Plaut. Cic. Ov. Mart. Quint.): 2. 55. 2.

multus. plures as the opposite of *οἱ ὅλλοι* (Plaut.): 2. 54. 7 *patres consilia inde non publica sed in privato seductaque plurimum conscientia habuere.*

plurimus sing. with intensive meaning (Plaut. Ter. Lucil. Virg. Hor. Ov. Mart. Stat. Sil. Quint. Plin. min.): 4. 38. 4 and 6. 24. 7 *labor*; 36. 7. 9 *opera*.

munio with *ab* (Col.): 22. 1. 3 *mutando nunc uestem nunc tegumenta capitis errore etiam sese ab insidiis munierat.*

With *aduersus* (Sall. Plin. N.H.): 24. 44. 6 *aduersus bella munierunt Romanum imperium.*

neglegens with genitive (Cic. Tac. Suet. Pacat.): 5. 46. 3.

nitior with *ardua per loca* or *per ardua* (Pacuv. Curt.): 25. 13. 14 *deturbant nitentes per ardua hostes.*

nocceo. nocens as noun (sing. Cic. Sen. trag.; plur. Ov. Sen. rhet.); in plur. 2. 5. 9; 5. 11. 16; 8. 20. 10.

non with subjunctive for *ne* (Plaut. Ter. Virg. Hor. Sen. Quint.): 6. 41. 10.

nouus. nouissime, 'finally' (Hirt. Sall. Planc. Sen. Quint.): 10. 1. 6.

oblectamentum (Cic. Sen. Plin. N.H. Suet.): in plur. 39. 6. 8.

obloquor absol. (Plaut. Cic. Curt. Gell. Tert.): 1. 40. 6.

occasio. per occasiones (Suet.; with *has* or *easdem* Cels.): 2. 11. 2; 32. 15. 9; 34. 13. 2; 39. 25. 6.

omitto with infinitive (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Hor. Just.): 21. 18. 12.

opera in plur. 'labourers' (Cic. Col. Tac. Suet.; in sing. Hor.): 1. 56. 1.

operae pretium est without infinitive (Sall.; without *pretium* Enn.): 31. 45. 9.

oportet with subjunctive (Cato Cic. Hor.): 6. 18. 9; 22. 39. 18; 32. 21. 37.

- opus* with ablative and *in* with accusative (Liv. epit.): 5. 10. 5 *maiore pecunia in stipendium opus erat*.
- ora*, 'region' (Cic. Lucr. Virg. Hor. Ov. Plin. *N.H.*): 9. 37. 1.
- otiosus*, 'politically quiet' (Plaut. Cic.): 40. 35. 1.
- paciscor* with *ne* (Hor.): 37. 32. 10; 38. 24. 4.
- paenitet* with accusative of the person foll. by infin. (Cic.): 1. 8. 3.
- palam est* with accusative and infinitive (Plaut. Plin. *N.H.*): 31. 14. 8.
- palam fieri* with accusative and infinitive (Cic.): 29. 5. 6.
- pascuum* in plur. (Cic. Catull. Virg. Hor. Ov. Sen. Plin. *N.H.* Juv.): 24. 3. 4.
- periculum est* with *ne* (Cic. Nep. Fronton): 33. 38. 3; 35. 23. 8.
- permitto* with dative only (Cic.): 23. 2. 8.
- pernium* (Varro Tac.): 30. 10. 5 *tabulas superintrauit ut pernium in totum ordinem esset*.
- placet* with subjunctive (Apul.): 35. 23. 8 *placere senatui, ad eum exercitum equites scriberet*.
- ploratus* in sing. (Cic. poet. Curt. Plin. *N.H.* Vulg.): 2. 33. 8; 5. 21. 11; 5. 42. 4; 23. 42. 5; 26. 9. 7.
- populares*, 'associates' (Sall. Sen.): 6. 17. 2, see Oxford text *app. crit.*
- populariter*, 'democratically' (Cic. Juv.): 27. 31. 4.
- posco* with *ut* (Cic. once in fr. Tac. Juv. Augustine): 2. 65. 2; 5. 28. 9.
- posterus*. in *posterum* sc. *diem* (Caes. Cic. Just.): 26. 17. 9.
- postulo* with subjunctive (Caes. Nep. Plin. min.). To Georges' 3. 45. 10 and 22. 53. 12 add 21. 12. 5 and 35. 8. 3.
- potestas*. For *p. alicui fit* with the infinitive Georges curiously cites 34. 13. 5 with the reading *ostendendi* for *ostendere*.
- praecello* absol. (Plaut. Claud. Quadr. Lucr. Plin. *N.H.* Tac. Suet. Dig.): 5. 27. 1.
- praecept* of time with *ad*; 25. 34. 14.
- praecipio* with subjunctive (Caes. Sall. Plin. min.): 44. 27. 9.
- praecipito* passive in middle sense (Sall. Curt. Ov. Val. Flacc.): 21. 25. 9; 22. 6. 5; 25. 16. 15; 36. 30. 4; 38. 2. 14; 40. 4. 15.
- With ablative (Caes. Virg. Ov. Curt. Stat.): 9. 22. 7.
- praeopto* with infinitive (Plaut. Caes. Val. Max. Curt. Tac. Just. Sulp. Sev.): 26. 30. 6.
- praetereo*. *praeterit*, 'escapes one,' with accusative and infinitive (Cic.): 38. 17. 2.
- de praeterito* 3. 19. 12.
- ex praeterito* 27. 2. 3.
- praeteregreior* trans. (Cic. auct. bell. Afr. Sall. Tac.). To Mr. Anderson's 35. 30. 11 and 45. 33. 8 add 35. 4. 4.
- praestus* with cold (Plin. *N.H.*): 21. 40. 9.
- pridie quam* with subjunctive 22. 38. 8 *Pauli una, pridie quam ex urbe proficisceretur, contio fuit*.
- procerus* of trees (Cic. Catull. Virg. Hor. Ov. Plin. *N.H.* Plin. min.): 24. 3. 4.
- profanum* (Tac.): 5. 52. 7 *in profano deseri placet sacra*.
- promitto* with gerundive 3. 45. 3 *puellam sistendam in aduentum eius qui pater dicatur promittat*.
- propinquo* intrans. (absol. Virg. Stat. Aur. Vict. Amm.; with dative Virg. Tac. Gell. Lact. Amm.; with accusative Sall. Tac.): absol. 21. 46. 4; with dative 28. 37. 7.
- pudendus* (Cic. Virg. Ov. Plin. *N.H.* Sil. Quint. Tac. Suet. Lampr. Claud. Mam.): 23. 3. 11; 25. 6. 10; 40. 56. 3.
- pugnax* of persons (Cic. Hor. Prop. Ov. Sen. Sil. Tac.): 22. 37. 8.
- pugno aduersus aliquem* (Nep. Liv. epit. and, with *aduersum* or *aduorsum*, Sall.). To the two examples from the *Thesaurus* and the four given by Mr. Anderson, from which 22. 47. 10 should be removed as being an example of *aduersus aliquem pugnam in eo*, add 21. 41. 10 and 22. 39. 5.

- pulchritudo* lit. (Cic. Plin. *N.H.* Plin.min. Flor. Suet. Gell.): 1. 7. 5.
Pythius. Lewis and Short and Georges record *Pythicus* from Livy but not *Pythius*;
 see 23. 11. 3 and 29. 10. 6.
queror with accusative and infinitive (Q. Metell. Num. Cic. Hor. Ov. Sen. trag. Val.
 Flacc.): 45. 13. 10.
ratio est with dative and infinitive (Tac.): 5. 54. 6.
recens ad, 'fresh for': 4. 33. 12.
recuso with *quominus* (Cic. Caes. Nep.): 28. 40. 10; 42. 33. 3; 43. 16. 12.
 With *ne* (Cic. Caes.): 43. 17. 8.
refert. For *refert* with genitive Georges cites only Sall. Quint. Plin.min. Juv.
 Lewis and Short quote Livy 34. 27. 6 but wrongly say that it is the only
 example in Livy; see 40. 34. 10.
regio. *e regione* with genitive, 'opposite' (Cic. Caes.): 38. 5. 2; 38. 7. 7.
religio. *religio est* with accusative and infinitive (Fab. Pict. Plin. *N.H.*): 6. 27. 4.
in religionem venire ut 10. 37. 16.
religionem facere with dative of gerundive 9. 29. 10.
repello lit. with ablative of place whence (Ov. Curt.): 25. 26. 5.
res. *in rem est* with accusative and infinitive (Plaut. Ter.): 44. 19. 3.
sanguineus, 'blood-red' (Cic. Virg. Ov. Col. Plin. *N.H.* Sil. Dig.): 25. 7. 8.
satisfacio de, 'give satisfaction for' (Caes. once): 42. 30. 11; 42. 36. 3.
 Georges cites Sen. rhet. for *satisfacere alicui de corio* and *satisfieri alicui de corio*
alicuius, but not even he knows of Livy 2. 35. 1 *nisi Cn. Marcio uincti dedantur*
tribuni, nisi de tergo plebis Romanae satisfiat.
sensus in plur. 'sentiments' (Cic. Nep. Ov. Plin.min.): 40. 21. 11.
sententia est with accusative and infinitive 8. 37. 11.
 With *ut* 34. 60. 3.
sicut eram, etc. to express unchanged condition (Nep. Ov. Curt. Luc. Stat. Suet. Just.).
 To Mr. Anderson's 24. 40. 13 add 21. 49. 6; 22. 1. 14; 27. 43. 4.
sin minus without verb (Cic.): 1. 47. 3.
sollicitus with ablative (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Virg. Hor. Ov. Val. Max. Curt. Sen.):
 23. 15. 9.
sopire fig. (Cic. Lucr. Virg. Vell. Val. Max. Col. Plin. *N.H.* Cypr. Claud. Sulp. Sev.):
 3. 16. 4.
subeo. *subit* with subject clause (Ov. Curt. Plin. *N.H.*): 45. 5. 11 *subiit animum in se*
nimirum receptam labem.
sumo animos (Ov.): 6. 23. 3.
summatim, 'summarily' (Lucil. Cic. Lucr. Varro Sen. Col. Quint. Suet. Amm. Dig.):
 9. 36. 5.
suscipio with gerundive (Quint. Just.): 2. 43. 3 *susceperat rem militarem impediendam*.
sustineo with infinitive (Ov. Vell. Val. Max. Curt. Sen. Plin. *N.H.* Quint. Plin.min.
 Suet.): 23. 9. 7.
taceo used transitively (with pronoun Plaut. Ter. Cic. Plin. *N.H.*; otherwise Ter.
 Virg. Hor. Ov. Sen. trag. Mart. Lampr.): 9. 37. 6 *esse praeterea telum aliud*
occultum: scituros in tempore; interea taceri opus esse; 25. 6. 10 ut clades taceam.
 With dative 42. 40. 10.
tegula in sing. (Cic. *ad Att.* IX. 7. 5. Ov. Mart. Juv.): 5. 55. 3 *tegula publice praedita est*.
tempto with infinitive (Lucr. Hirt. Nep. Virg. Ov. Curt. Pers. Quint. Juv.): 32. 21. 10.
terra. *terra mari* 41. 3. 1; 44. 22. 8.
timeo with *de* (Cic. Caes. Curt.): 36. 29. 7.
 With indir. interrog. cl. (Plaut. Ter. Cic. Nep.): 24. 22. 14.
titulus. *titulum inscribo* with accusative and infinitive: 23. 19. 18 *statua eius indicio fuit*
. . . cum titulo inscripto M. Anicium uotum soluisse.

- tolerabilis*. *tolerabilis est* with infinitive (Cic. *ad fam.* VII. 30. 1): 10. 11. 12.
transuersus. *ex transuerso* lit. (Plaut. *Lucr.*): 1. 13. 1; 2. 20. 3; 3. 62. 8; 10. 41. 5;
 33. 18. 18; 37. 42. 5.
tristis of taste (Catull. *Lucr.* Virg. Tib. Ov. Plin. *N.H.* Sil.): 42. 40. 3 *sicut medici cum salutis causa tristiora remedia adhibent*.
turbo *impers.* passive (Ter. Cic. *Lucr.* Virg.): 5. 17. 5.
turris. The reference in Forcellini should be 33. 48. 1 instead of 33. 38.
tutela. *sub tutela* 2. 1. 4; 24. 8. 19; 25. 29. 6; 39. 9. 2; 41. 6. 12; 45. 18. 2.
tutus. *ex tuto*. To Mr. Anderson's 10. 34. 8; 21. 26. 5; 30. 11. 6; 31. 42. 5; 38. 6. 9
 add 22. 12. 10; 22. 15. 5; 26. 38. 6; 42. 39. 7.
ualidus with *ad* (lit. Apul. *Lampr.*; fig. Tac.): 29. 34. 4 *nequaquam satis ualido non modo ad lacesendum hostem sed ne ad tuendos quidem a populationibus agros equitatu accepto*.
uastatio in plur. (Cic. Tac.): 1. 52. 3.
uastus. *silentium uastum* occurs in 10. 34. 6 and three times in Tacitus, but is not to be found in the *lexica* at all.
uelamen (Virg. Ov. Sen. Tac. Juv. Ambr. Augustine): 1. 32. 6.
uelut cum introducing a comparison (Enn. Virg. Ov.): 3. 17. 4.
uicinitas (Ter. Cic. *Hirt.*): 'vicinity' 33. 33. 6; 'nearness' 39. 9. 6.
uicinus fig., 'related to' (Cic. Sen. Plin. *N.H.* Quint.): 22. 12. 12.
uito with *ne* (Cic. Cels. Quint.): 42. 40. 10 (*uitare* ed. Frob. 1531 for *V.*'s *uidere*).
uiuo, 'dwell,' with ablative without *in*: 3. 13. 10; 4. 3. 2.
ultra preposition of time (Cels. Sen. Quint. Tac.). To Mr. Anderson's 4. 39. 7 add 41. 10. 13.
uorago fig. (Cic. Ov. Val. Max. Quint. Amm. Augustine): 29. 17. 13.

The eccentricities of Lewis and Short range from statements like that which tells us that *curabilis* in Juv. XVI. 21 means 'that is to be apprehended' or 'feared' to misprints like that which produces the assertion that Sallust in *Iug.* XLIII. 1 means by *fama inuiolata* that the reputation of Metellus was—not, as was intended to be written, 'unassailable' but—'unavailable.' The following is a handful of the blemishes which concern Livy:

- adsuesco*. In 38. 17. 5 *Romanis Gallici tumultus adsueti, etiam uanitates notae sunt* there is no example of *adsuesco* with the genitive.
ambitiose. In 1. 35. 2 *isque* (sc. Tarquinius Priscus) *primus et petisse ambitiose regnum et orationem dicitur habuisse ad conciliandos plebis animos compositam* the meaning of *ambitiose* is not 'ambitiously, ostentatiously' but 'by canvassing.'
amigro occurs at 1. 34. 7, but the word finds no place in the dictionary.
colos as the old form of *color* is given six references from Plaut. *Lucr.* Sall. and Plin. *N.H.* but nothing is said of Livy 28. 26. 14.
honor. Livy should have been put with Hor. and Tac. as using both *honos* and *honor*. Compare *honor* at 4. 8. 7 and *honos*, for example, at 2. 12. 15.
inritus. In 28. 29. 4 *auferat omnia inrita obliuio* the penultimate word is not fem. sing. but acc. plur.
insuesco. In 5. 6. 1 *si, mediusfidius, ad hoc bellum nihil pertineret, ad disciplinam certe militiae plurimum intererat insuescere militem nostrum non solum parata victoria frui* . . . there is no example of *insuesco* with *ad*.
proprius. The comparative of this word is said to occur in Ov. *Met.* 12. 284, *Ex Ponto* 1. 2. 152 and Livy 4. 27. 3. The word occurs in none of these places.

The following are some of the shortcomings concerning Livy in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*:

- abdo* with *in* and ablative not cited from Livy; see, for example, 9. 7. 11 and 25. 39. 1.
abstraho. At col. 199. 61 for 'Isid. orig. 24. 26. 12' read 'Liv. 24. 26. 12.'

animus. *animum sumere* not cited from Livy; see 6. 23. 2 *multitudinis sumentis animos*, 'taking heart.'

At col. 97. 73 for '7. 10. 11' read '7. 40. 11.'

consilium with *in* and accusative not cited; see 27. 20. 3.

conspicio with accusative and infinitive not cited from Livy; see 21. 33. 2.

consuesco. Three examples of *consuetus* are given, but they are all from the first decade, so add 36. 7. 5. Another early example is in 2. 61. 5.

contemno. There are no examples of *contemptus* from Livy; see 1. 49. 6; 2. 55. 3;

35. 11. 7.

conueniens. No example from Livy of this word used absolutely; see 24. 5. 5.

deinde. *brevi deinde* is quoted from Curt. Tac. and Amm. but not from Livy; see

24. 4. 9. Neither is *dein brevi* quoted; see 21. 4. 2.

desino. 32. 7. 6 *iam timeri desiderat* is wrongly put among the examples of an active infinitive.

deterreo. Of *deterreo* followed by an infinitive no example is given from Livy; see

42. 3. 3 *sociis deterritis id sacrilegium prohibere*.

Mr. Anderson pays a deserved tribute to Georges' lexicon, but he will forgive my saying that it is not a work that should be used to the exclusion of the Corradini-Perin edition of Forcellini's lexicon. He says 'Forcellini-Corradini was, unfortunately, not available.' How unfortunate that was can be seen from the fact that twelve of his notes contain information already given in that edition. Indeed eight contain information that can be found in Forcellini-De Vit.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE *ORPHIC ARGONAUTICA*.

(LINES 460-498; 729-756; 1038 AND SQQ.)

THE author of the *Orphic Argonautica* was, except by personal election, no poet. He was, however, a very devout reader of poetry and, had he only been irradiated by the same Celestial Light, might well have been a Milton, for he went to work in very much the same way. Books, and not personal experience, were his guides. His mind was stored with the lines and phrases of other poets; he read his authors attentively: but he did not always understand them, and he lacked the Miltonic art of giving borrowed gems new value from their setting.

Since he wrote about the fourth century A.D., probably later than Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus, he had all Greek literature to draw upon; and he had at least one complete model before him, the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius. There is more than one resemblance, albeit slight, to the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, and he was clearly familiar, as he ought to be, with the fourth Pythian ode of Pindar. But his range was not confined to Argonautic literature. Even apart from geographical detail, his poem bears close resemblance to that of Dionysius Periegetes; he uses the facts and often the vocabulary of Herodotus and Strabo; he seems considerably indebted to the *Prometheus Vincetus*; and he had a proper epic respect for Homer. But Apollonius is naturally his favourite model. Since his whole poem is roughly equal to one of Apollonius' four books, it is clear that he must abridge considerably, and since his omissions are largely mythological, one might credit him with a stricter regard for relevancy; but his passage on the rites which opened the sacred grove (discussed by A. D. Nock in *J.H.S.* XLVI., p. 50 sqq.), and his catalogue of the plants growing there, which vies with Theophrastus, give the lie to this suggestion. The poem as a whole is strangely patchy: at one moment he seems able to tell a good story simply and directly, at another he is complex and extravagant; at one moment one begins to think him a poet, and at the next he is a versifier of the most prosy and tasteless kind.

The geographical passages are particular examples of this generalization. They are readily detachable from the rest of the poem and they combine in a rather odd way marked indebtedness to Apollonius with marked divergence from him. Dotin, in his posthumous edition of the *Argonautica* (Paris, 1930), treats the geography summarily, saying that it 'demanderait une longue étude que nous ne pouvons entreprendre ici' (Introduction, p. lxviii). It may seem over-ambitious to attempt such a study, and these notes do not claim to be complete. But it seems that the geographical passages are worth studying in some detail, and, further, that they yield one possible explanation of the patchiness and inconsistency of the poem as a whole. The author of the poem will, for convenience, be alluded to as Orpheus.

I. 460-498.

For the first three lines, 460-462, he copies very closely Ap. Rh. I. 568 sqq., though Apollonius uses more space. For instance, Orpheus *Τισαίη δ' ἀπέκρυφθεν ἄκρη* is represented in Apollonius by *Τισαίην εὐκηλοὶ ὑπὲρ δολιχὴν θέον ἄκρην* (568); Apollonius then has a pretty description of the fish following Orpheus' music as sheep follow the shepherd, then—

Ap. Rh.

φαίνε
ἀπὸ
Πειρε
ἀκτῇ

There A

Ap. Rh.

ἡὼθεν

πόντος
δηρ
μέλλο
ῥέε

He

not, str

does no

Orpheu

εἰρημέν

as well

pensate

ἐρμυνοῦ

σκόπελ

the Sh

Perieg

streng

Hippo

curren

by Str

verbal

this O

freeze

Samot

Lemn

with t

The la

T

geogr

where

it is

θελξί

A

the p

Abyd

Pitye

other

in J.

Ap. Rh. 582 :

ἔδυνε δὲ Σηπτιάς ἀκρη
φαίνεται δ' εἰναλίη Σκίαθος, φαίνοντο δ'
ἄπωθεν
Πειρεσιαὶ Μάγνησα θ' ὑπέυδιος ἠπείροιο
ἀκτὴ καὶ τύμβος Δολοπήϊος.

O.A. 460 :

καὶ Σηπτιάς ἀκτὴ,
φάνθη δὲ Σκίαθος, Δόλοπός τ' ἀνεφαίνετο
σῆμα,

There Apollonius makes them land and spend two days. Then—

Ap. Rh. 594 :

ἦῶθεν δ' Ὀμόλην αὐτοσχεδὸν εἰσορόωντες

πόντῳ κεκλιμένην παρεμέτρεον· οὐδ' ἔτι
δηρὸν
μέλλον ὑπὲκ ποταμοῖο βαλεῖν Ἀμύροιο
ῥέεθρα.

O.A. 462 :

ἀγχίαλός θ' Ὀμόλη ρεῖθρον τ' Ἀμύροιο
ἐναύλου
ὅς διὰ πολλὴν γαῖαν ἔει μεγάλῳ βρομον
ὑδωρ.

Here our Orpheus follows Apollonius in two geographical mistakes. Homole is not, strictly speaking, either ἀγχίαλος or πόντῳ κεκλιμένη, and the river Amyrus, which does not flow into the sea but into Lake Boibeis, could not possibly be within view. Orpheus here *peccat fortius* by the addition of the epithet *μεγαλόβρομον*, which is ἀπαξ εἰρημένον; Amyrus, whose course was through a plain, was in all likelihood inaudible as well as invisible. He then omits Eurymenae and Ossa (Ap. Rh. 597, 8), but compensates by a picturesque description of Olympos (Ὀλύμπου δὲ βαθυσκοπέλου πρηνῶνας ἐρυννοῦς, 464), which is independent of Apollonius, who nowhere uses either βαθυσκοπέλος, which is peculiar to Orpheus and Q. Smyrnaeus, or πρηνών, which occurs in the *Shield of Herakles*, in Alexandrine poets other than Apollonius, and in Dionysius Periegetes. Orpheus' next line and a half

καὶ Ἄθω δενδρώδεα κάμψαν

Παλλήνην τ' εὐρείαν, ἰδὲ ζαθέην Σαμοθράκην

strengthen his declaration of independence. δενδρώδης appears only in Lycophron and Hippocrates; κάμψαν is found in Herodotus and in the geographers, though its widest currency was, no doubt, in the proverb Μαλέας δὲ κάμψας ἐπιλάθου τῶν οἰκάδε, quoted by Strabo viii. 378; Apollonius always uses γνάμπτειν in this connexion. But these verbal independences are nothing to the divergence in fact. Under the influence of this Orpheus the mountain-tops (and Athos is traditionally a mountain-top that freezes) not merely bow but even set to partners. Then his Argonauts touch at Samothrace, a visit which Apollonius quite rightly defers till after their stay in Lemnos. Then, after a pause for initiation into the mysteries, they reach Lemnos with two Homeric gestures

Σιντιακαῖς δ' ἐπ' ὀφρύσσιν ἐκέλαμεν ὠκύαλον νηῦν

Λήμνῳ ἐν ἡγαθέῃ.

The latter comes from a passage which Milton also could not resist.

The episode of the Lemnian women is omitted from this examination, as non-geographical: it is considerably abridged, Orpheus giving twelve lines (472-483) where Apollonius gives three hundred, and one detail in it is altered: in Apollonius it is Herakles who recalls the heroes to their quest, in Orpheus it is himself, θελξίφρονί θ' ὕμνῳ ἡμετέρῳ.

Apollonius is then predominant again, with two reservations. One is the order of the places in the *Troad*, which appears correctly in Apollonius as Ida, Dardania, Abydos, Percote, Abarnis, Pityeia, while Orpheus gives Abydos, Ida, Dardania, Pitye, Abarnis, Percote, which Aesepus washes with silvery streams (488). The other is the phrase *στενίης ἀπάτερθεν Ἀβύδου* (485). This is challenged by Platt, in *J.P.* XXVI., p. 74, who asks 'why should they sail ἀπάτερθεν?' and says that

Abydos 'was no narrower than any other town.' The answer to his question is surely 'because they did not land': ἀπάτερθεν meaning 'aloof from' is supported by examples (*Iliad* V. 445; Hes. *Theog.* 1153; Orph. *Lithica* 395); and the epithet στευνή is appropriate both to the town, which is on a narrow spit of land, and to the famous Narrows, τὰ στενά, over which Xerxes built his bridge. In line 487, Περκώτης τ' εὔσταχυν αἶαν, εὔσταχυς is a rare word applied in other places where it occurs (Theophr. *H.P.* IX. iii. 4; *Anth. Pal.* V. 275, VI. 36, VII. 589) to plants and growing things, but it seems in accordance with fact, since Percote is well-watered and tilled (cf. Leaf, *Strabo on the Troad*, p. 111 sqq.). It is not, however, watered by Aesepus, which is some way further along the coast, as Apollonius makes clear. Orpheus has a rooted conviction that rivers are silver (v. 1132 infra): Homer calls the water of Aesepus black (*Iliad* II. 825).

The next four lines are nondescript, but after them Orpheus has a detail which both is and is not Apollonian:

γλανκώπιδι Τριτογενεῖη
θῆκαν αἰείραντες βριθὺν λίθον (492, 3).

In Ap. Rh. 955 they 'cast away their small anchor-stone by the advice of Tiphys and left it beneath a fountain, the fountain of Artakie; and they took another meet for their purpose—βριθύν' (958). Here Orpheus' process is interesting: he leaves a larger gift with more ceremony, but he uses Apollonius' phrases with which to do it. His next lines

ἐνθα τε νύμφαι
κρήνη ὑπ' Ἀρτακίη καλὰ νάματα πλημμύρουσιν (493, 4)

show the same mixture of dependence and independence—νῆμα and πλημμύρειν (in this sense) do not occur anywhere in Apollonius, but are common in the Orphic poems. νῆμα appears also in Aesch. *P.V.* 805. There follows a Homeric phrase—πλατὺν Ἑλλήσποντον (495)—probably as a cliché, but with a certain undesigned correctness, since Hellespont has by this time broadened into Propontis. The remaining three lines are not due to Apollonius, and leave the Argonauts becalmed at Cyzicus.

Orpheus in this passage can be seen deviating from Apollonius sometimes in mere error, but sometimes with some justification in fact. Athos is δεινὴ δῶδης, Percote is εὔσταχυς, and mariners might well be becalmed at Cyzicus. These particular details are not traceable to other extant sources, but are, from their closely attendant mistakes, surely not the product of autopsy. The first two might well be lucky shots: the third seems to have something in common with Valerius Flaccus at this point (II. 629, 630):

terra sinu medio Pontum iacet inter et Hellen
ceu fundo prolata maris.

There is nothing to show whether Orpheus knew and copied Valerius or whether they were both faithful to some other model. Valerius is here independent of Apollonius, since he introduces, as Diodorus also does (IV. 42), the rescue of Hesione by Herakles at Sigeum.

II. 729-756.

This passage begins at the point where the Argonauts, spending some days with King Lycus, amid lavish entertainment (φίλατο δ' αὖ νυκτὰς τε καὶ ἡμέματα συννεχὲς αἰεί, 721), have lost their helmsman Tiphys, who has died of disease. They decide to entrust the steering to Ancaeus, whose skill in seamanship is acknowledged by all. With him at the helm they pass the following places, in the following order according to the received text:

The streams of Parthenius (730), 'which they call Callichorus' (731), the land of the Paphlagonians (734), Cape Carambis (735), 'where Thermodon is poured forth and the streams of Halys, drawing the seaward-flowing eddies to broad Aegialus (or to the wide shore)' (736-7), Themiscyra (739), where the Amazons' cities are (740), the Chalybes, Tibareni, and Becheires (741) with the Mossyni (742), then the Macrones (Eschenbach), the neighbours of the Mariandyni (744), the steep mount of (?) Syme (748), the 'stream of Araxes, the loud-roaring river, from which Thermodon, and Phasis, and Tanais flow, where are the famous tribes of Colchi and Heniochi and Abasgi (749-51) the inmost anchorages of the Ouri, Chindaei, Charandaei and Solymi (752, 3) the race of Assyrians and the rough promontory of Sinope (752) the Philyrae, Napatae, Sapeires, Byzeres and Sigynnae' (755, 6).

This passage presents at the same time marked coincidences and marked contrasts with the corresponding narrative in Apollonius. His second book provides two models, one at 360-398, where Phineus describes the route the Argonauts are to take, and a more diffuse account, between 942 and 1261, of their actual passage along the south coast of the Euxine. A combination of these two, which are consistent with one another, gives the following itinerary:

Callichorus, Parthenius, Carambis, Aegialus, Sinope in the Assyrian land, the rivers Halys and Iris and Thermodon, the plain of Doias, where the Amazons dwell at Themiscyra in three separate settlements, the Chalybes, the headland of Zeus Genetaeus among the Tibareni, the Mossynoeci, Philyres, Macrones, Becheires, Sapeires, Byzeres and finally the Colchians.

This order tallies in the main with that given by the ancient geographers and therefore shown in classical atlases.

The divergences of the Orphic account are clear at once:

(1) It introduces new tribes—e.g. the Mariandyni (744) who ought to have been left behind with Lycus, their king; the Heniochi and the Abasgi in 751; the Napatae in 755; the Sigynnae in 756; and the whole collection in 753. There will be more to say about these later.

(2) Those tribes and places which are the same appear in a different order.

(3) There is a mistaken identification of Callichorus with Parthenius (731), a new place Σύμη or Σύνδη (Hermann) (748), and some very startling information about the river Araxes, which, apart from that, they could not have seen, as it does not reach the sea in these parts, but which roars loud, as Amyrus did, with another ἀπαξ εἰρημένον.

The resemblances are much less apparent at first sight, but are distinctly noticeable when the passages are compared in detail. This is not possible now; it must suffice to say that a great deal of the phraseology is clearly derived from Apollonius. A rough numerical computation puts it at 73 per cent. As regards the facts narrated, Apollonius is followed closely down to 742, apart from Callichorus and Parthenius; the collection of tribes includes all his, though he places them differently, and the information about the Araxes resembles that given by him in IV. 133 about the Eridanus, the Rhone and the Rhine, which behave in the same way. Moreover, the earlier geographical passage in the Orphic *Argonautica*, 460-498, makes it clear that Orpheus is likely to be using him as a source.

Given these correspondences, it is hard to understand why Orpheus should diverge as much as the present text makes him do. It is not as though he might be conceived to be following another source: no other would give him the tribes arranged like this. A certain amount of latitude prevails in such geographers as the pseudo-Scymnus, who in fact has this same account of the Araxes, which he attributes (869) to Hecataeus: but Dionysius Periegetes, with whom Orpheus seems elsewhere to have strong affinities, places the tribes exactly as Apollonius does (though working from east to west), only omitting the Sapeires. These may be

connected with the Saspeires mentioned by Herodotus (IV. 37). Nor again is the passage precisely on a par with that (485 sqq.) where Orpheus disarranges the places in the *Troad*: metrical convenience might have influenced him there, but is no factor here, since complete lines are involved.

I suggest that the text is at fault, and that part of the author's credit can be saved by some rearrangement of the lines. This was proposed by Platt in *J.P. XXXIII.* (1914), p. 266. He wished to rearrange lines 745-752 in the following order: 745, 750, 746-7, 751, 748-9, 752. This seems to me less satisfactory than a change which begins later.¹ I should prefer to rearrange as follows, reading 754 after 735, thus getting Sinope where it should be, between Carambis and Thermodon (this has the further advantage of mitigating another error, since Thermodon most emphatically does not flow *ἐνὶ Καραμβιακῇ ἁκρῇ*), placing 755 and 756 between 744 and 745, and interchanging lines 752 and 753. Lines 754-6 as they stand make neither grammar nor geography. The latter demand cannot be pressed in the case of this author; but the arrangement I suggest, without eliminating his errors entirely, at least saves him from the charge of complete irresponsibility.

According to my proposed arrangement, the lines 751 and 753 read as a digression on the neighbourhood of the great watershed, especially the regions surrounding the Tanais, which he names last. Geographically the Heniochi and Abasgi, which are real tribes, do belong between the Tanais and the Phasis, while the *ὄν* of line 752 relates to the *μεγαβρεμέτον ποταμοῖο* of 749 before the digression began. Line 752 marks the end of the voyage (Apollonius calls their bourn *μυχὸς πόντον*, II. 1246), and surely ought to end the paragraph. As the line stands in the printed text, it is open to the objection that *μυχάτοις ἐπεπλείμεν ὄρμοις* is unsuitably used with tribes which they merely passed. It has been proposed (by Slothouwer) to alter these words to *μυχάτους παρεπλείμεν ὄρμους*, but my present suggestion seems simpler.

As regards the collection of interlopers in 753, two of them, the Charandaei and the Solymi, occur again, in 1302 infra, among the tribes sent by Aietes in pursuit of the Argonauts, whom they meet in Phaeacia much later. The Charandaei are named also in 1047 among the tribes the Argonauts pass in sailing up the Phasis. It is suggested by Tomaschek in *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v., that they may be a reflexion of a southern place-name like Charandra (Pliny VI. 167). *Οὔροι* has been questioned, and various substitutes, all very unlike in form, have been proposed. Platt says it is idle to guess at it; but if the possibility of moving the line be accepted, I would suggest very tentatively that the true reading might be *Οὔννοι*, the Huns, who appear in Dionysius Periegetes, 731, between the Skythai and the *Κάσπιοι ἄνδρες*, i.e. to the north of the Caspian Sea. Pliny, VI. 48, has a river Chindrum in the neighbourhood of the Chorasmī, which might conceivably be responsible for the Chindaei. In 755 the Napatae ought to be in Scythia, if anywhere, since Pliny, VI. 50, and Diodorus, XII. 43. 3, have Napae or Napaei there. But I suspect Orpheus of having combined these with a misreading of Strabo XII. 548, which has *Ἀππαῖται*, near little Armenia, in close proximity to some people called *Σαῖνοι*, *οὓς πρότερον ἐκάλονν Μάκρωνας*. As to the Sigynnae, Professor Minns (*Scythians and Greeks*, p. 102) says 'Strabo puts the Sigynni (*sic*) on the Caspian, and Niederle seems inclined to think him right.'

Even if thus straightened out the passage still retains some tangles. There is, for instance, the confounding of Parthenius with Callichorus. Schneider conceives that a line or lines must have dropped out between 730 and 731. But it is not beyond Orpheus to have confused the two rivers, and Schneider's conclusion at 738

¹ Platt also takes Helike as a place-name, whereas it is surely the constellation of the Bear, as in line 1104. Cf. Ap. Rh. II. 360' *Ἑλικῆς κατεπάρτιον Ἀρκτον*.

—'poetae error suus est relinquendus'—may well apply here also. The allusion in line 732 is presumably to the Orphic *Bacchica*—cf. Ap. Rh. II. 904-909, which associate Callichorus with Dionysus.

There are two other points, textual as well as geographical, which demand attention. The earlier is the line 739, where the MSS. reading

μακρὰ δέ μιν σκύρης βοιαντίδος (βοιατίδος) ἄψα κείται

is nonsense. Gesner made the obvious correction *Θεμισκύρης Δοιαντίδος*, but ἄψα κείται, the bulk of which is an anticipation of ἄσπεα κείται in the following line, has not been satisfactorily emended. Heyne proposed ἄγκε' ἀνείται, but this is liable to several objections:

(1) It does not help in any way to account for the only surviving trace of the original.

(2) ἄγκεα—glens—are out of place in Themiscyra, well known as a plain, which is called *Δοιαντος πεδίου* in Ap. Rh. II. 373, the source of *Δοιαντίδος* here.

(3) Since this line is part of the narrative, and not subordinate information like the next, the sense requires a verb in the imperfect or aorist, preferably the latter, to match *ἔκετο* in 735 and *ἐκέλευμεν* in 743. In the former of those places the definite piece of information, with the historic tense, is followed by a more general description of the neighbourhood, with the verb in the present. The sense also requires a verb which will fit the dative *ἐπιθρόσκουσι*.

I wonder whether the reading might not have been ἄλσπεα φάνθη or ἄλσε' ἐφάνθη. This gives a respectable sense—'to us as we sped on appeared the great groves . . .' φάνθη is used in this connexion in 461, and ἐφάνθη in this position in 16. ἄλσπεα could quite naturally have been confounded with ἄσπεα in the next line. Strabo XII. 547 describes the region as *εὐδενδρον*, and there is some reason to think that Orpheus had studied this portion of Strabo. ἄλσπεα can be used of wooded country in general, and may be so used at 762, *τείχος ἐρυμνὸν | Αἰήτω κατέφαινε καὶ ἄλσπεα*. The φ of φάνθη or ἐφάνθη might be some consolation for the solitary survivor ψ.

The other point is the doubtful *δρος αἰπύ* of 748. The MSS. read *Σύμης*, which Hermann changed to *Σίνδης*, a place presumably connected with the *Σίνδοι*, who, however, belong to the coast north of Phasis. Strabo I. 52 and XII. 548 has a *plain* Sidene in the neighbourhood of *Θεμισκύρα*—*πεζῶν εὐδαιμον* . . . *ἔχον χωρία ἐρυμνὰ ἐπὶ τῇ παραλίᾳ, τὴν τε Σίδην, ἀφ' ἧς ὀνομάσθη Σιδηνή*. Unfortunately a plain is not very like a mountain, except Through the Looking Glass. Otherwise I do not see why this word should not be *Σίδης*. The town Side is at the head of a bay formed by a projecting neck of land, the promontory Jasonium, traditionally named after the Argonauts, but appearing in none of the stories. This would give a parallel to the method of description practised elsewhere in this piece—a definite point followed by a vaguer description of the tribes around, without strict regard for their relation—such as, according to my rearrangement, you have with the river-system Araxes, etc.

III. 1038-1143.

Before discussing the other passage, it is necessary to say something about another line of approach to the study of it—the question of vocabulary. I think it is clear that the original Orphic writings used a somewhat specialized phraseology, much of which was derived from older epic, but not all. The occurrence of a word in, for instance, the *Orphic Hymns* does not necessarily stamp it as a part of the old Orphic vocabulary, because the hymns we have are of much later date. But the poets of the early fifth century, notably Aeschylus and Pindar, were undoubtedly acquainted with, if not influenced by, the Orphic writings, and when a word occurs both in Aeschylus and/or Pindar and in the *Orphic Hymns* it seems to me that there is a good case for regarding it as favoured by Orphic writers.

The writer of the *Argonautica* uses a fairly large number of words which may on this ground be described as Orphic. For example, at 1051 (and at 930) he has the word *ἄπλητος*, which does not occur in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*, though it does in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, but is used four times by Pindar, and two of these (*Pyth.* I. 21 and fr. 93) are in connexion with Typhon and Etna, in which context it occurs also in the *Prometheus Vinculus* 373. It appears also in the Orphic Hymn to Ouranos. Is it fanciful to suggest that it was also in the Orphic *Ἐρδς Δόγος* which described the *καταταρταρώσεις* of the Titans? Another word *ἀμπλακίη* (1040), which does not actually occur in the Orphic remains except for the *Argonautica*, is not a Homeric word, and is used in the *P.V.* 564 and in Pindar (four times, notably *Pyth.* II. 30 and *Ol.* VII. 24) in such a way as to suggest some such colour as the noun 'trespasses' might have in English secular literature. It occurs also in the fragments of Empedocles (115. 3). *χεῖμα* used with *ἄπλητος* in 1051, again a non-Homeric but Pindaric word, appears in one of the Orphic fragments, and is common in the Hymns. Other such words occurring in this passage are *πλημμύρειν* (1053), *ἄπλετος* (1061), *πύματος* and *βυθός* in 1066, *πέρας* in 1069, *αἶγλη* (1122) and others. *δίνη* (1130) and *ἄρρηκτος* (1143) are Homeric words, to which the Orphics seem to have given a new colour and significance. *δίνη* and its derivatives occur repeatedly in the *Orphic Hymns*, and also in the cosmogonical passage in the *Parabasis* of the *Birds*. The fact that some of these words are freely used by Apollonius, as *αἶγλη*, *βυθός*, and *δίνη* are, does not preclude the possibility that they may have gained new currency through Orphism.

This Orphic colour is very much stronger in the passage 1038-1043 than it is in either of the other two geographical passages (460 sqq. and 729 sqq.), which seem derived from Apollonius. It would take too long to give details, but after careful scrutiny I think it is fair to say that these 105 lines contain at least double the proportion in the two other passages. This increase in Orphic vocabulary is accompanied by a very noticeable decline in the influence of Apollonius. Homer is drawn upon directly much more frequently; his influence appears to be about equal to that of Orphism. A great many proper names and six individual words seem due to the geographers and Herodotus. One reason for this is not far to seek.

The passage 1038-1143 gives Orpheus' account of most of the return journey. It differs from the earlier geographical passages in that it is independent of Apollonius, describing from the very start a route different from his. According to Orpheus the Argonauts sailed up the Phasis as far as a narrow pass in the Caucasus, called Erytheia, where the Phasis parts into two streams, one of which, called Saranges, flows into Lake Maeotis. Proceeding this way they reach the lake, where they enter another river which takes them northward to the ocean, into which they emerge at the part called the Cronian or Dead Sea (1082). They then bear to the left, and after a painful stretch, during which they tow the ship, they reach the land of the Macrobii, whose blessings are described, and the Cimmerians, who live in darkness. They then pass Acheron and Hermioneia. I end the passage there because the rest of the account is more diffuse; they sight Ierne (Ireland?) and come to Circe's Island, outside the Pillars of Herakles. When they have passed these they resume the voyage according to Apollonius, though very much more briefly.

It does not seem that our Orpheus invented this account, since something of the kind existed before Diodorus, who in IV. 56 says that οὐκ ὀλίγοι τῶν τε ἀρχαίων σιγγραφῶν καὶ τῶν μεταγενεστέρων (ὧν ἐστὶ καὶ Τίμαιος) say that the Argonauts found their retreat cut off by Aietes, and so performed *πράξιν* . . . *παράδοξον καὶ μνήμης ἀξίαν* by sailing up the Tanais to its source, dragging the ship some way overland, and sailing down another river to the Ocean. They then travelled ἀπὸ τῶν ἄρκτων ἐπὶ τὴν δύσιν, keeping the land on their left, and came to Gadeira, where they reached τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς θάλασσαν.

It is to be noticed that Diodorus distinguishes two classes of historians who mention this memorable exploit, τῶν ἀρχαίων and τῶν μεταγενεστέρων: Timaeus, apparently one of the latter, seems to have flourished about 300 B.C. Further, Diodorus goes on to cite some pieces of evidence in support of its credibility, of which one—the dedication of a tripod by Jason at Lake Tritonis in Libya—is recorded also by Herodotus (IV. 179). This is not inconsistent with the Apollonian account, which Diodorus disbelieves, but he clearly regarded it as distinct. So there is some indication that the stories τῶν ἀρχαίων may be assigned to a period earlier than Herodotus. It is not, then, impossible that the Orphic *Argonautica* may be derived from a traditional Orphic version of the story current at least as early as the beginning of the fifth century B.C.

But it is not likely that it was derived entire. It is not homogeneous, and its component factors can perhaps best be made clear by a brief running commentary. It abounds in the names of tribes which have no warrant in evidence from elsewhere: the three mentioned in 1045, Gymni, Bouonomae, and Arkyes, are a sample of these. The Cerectici, in the next line, are placed by most geographers roughly where Orpheus has them—between Phasis and Maeotis—and are identified by Professor Minns with the present Circassians (*Scythians and Greeks*, p. 24). The proud Sindi are also placed here by other authorities. The Charandaei we have seen already. Caucasus stretches farther north than it should, and the strait Erytheia seems an importation from the West. The river Saranges behaves like a real river called Hypanis (not to be confused with the Hypanis that is identified with the Bug), but the source of its name is not clear. Arrian (*Indica* 4) has an Indian river Saranges, and Nonnus an Indian tribe called Sarangi or Salangi. Pliny (IV. 48) has a river Saranga beyond the Caucasus, and a river Secheries near *civitas Sindica* (VI. 5. 17). At 1056, where the Argonauts reach the Cimmerian Bosphorus, there is a corrupt reading *τριμόρουσι*, which has been emended by Wiel to *τρομεραῖσι* and by Abel again to *τρομερήσι*: I do not think I understand the meaning of this. *στομάτεσσι* would occupy the same space, and give the required metre and a good sense: Hypanis had two mouths and so had Tanais, which might well dominate the poet's imagination here. In 1057 the *βοοκλόπος Τίταν* may well be Herakles, who is called *Τίταν* in the Orphic Hymn to him (XII. 1). The objection felt by Hermann to associating the theft of the oxen of Geryon with this part of the world is met by a passage in Hdt. IV. 8 which brings Herakles to Scythia with them.

They then see more tribes: the Maeotae (1060) where they ought to be, Geloni (1061) much too far south, Bathyagri (1061) unknown, Sauromatae (1062) fairly correctly, Getae much too far east, and Hylaei slightly so (this is Hermann's emendation of Gymnaei), then two unknowns, Cecryphes and Arsopes, and the Arimaspi, altogether too European.

They then enter the river which takes them to ocean, but its name is missing. Schneider is clearly right in supposing a lacuna here. It seems probable that the missing name is Tanais, but the behaviour of the river is more like that of the Borysthenes, since it bears rather west of due north. It was, however, commonly held that Tanais went due north, though the Don's course up the river from its mouth is eastward. The tribes in 1073 are all unidentified.

It is unsatisfactory to dismiss so many names as unknown, but where an identification can be conjectured it is only very hazardous. Strabo and Pliny, in describing these regions, give a wealth of tribe-names (Strabo XI. 492 sqq., Pliny VI. iii. 12-22), some of which suggest tentative possibilities of identification. For example, the Bouonomae of 1045 seem to have something in common with the Moschi or Moschici of Strabo XI. 497 and 492. The *Ἀρκυες ἀγροῖωται* of the same line bear a faint resemblance to the *Ἀγροὶ καὶ Ἀρρηχοί* of Strabo 495. It has been noted already that the Charandaei (1046) may reflect some name like Charandra;

Strabo 494 provides another name, Κοροκονδαμίτις, with which they have some slight affinity. The Bathyagri (1061) suggest an alliance between Strabo's Agri and Pliny's river Bathys (Pliny VI. iii. 12), but are localized inappropriately to either: it may be that they represent the Scythian tribe Georgi or Aroteres, mentioned as two by Herodotus in his passage on the tribes of Scythia (IV. 17 and 18), but in fact more probably one. Strabo at XI. 495 has a story accounting for the epithet Ἀπάτουρος applied to Aphrodite at Phanagoria ὡς, ἐπιθεμένων ἐνταῦθα τῇ θεῇ τῶν Γιγάντων, ἐπικαλεσαμένη τὸν Ἡρακλέα κρύψειεν ἐν κευθμῶνί τινι, εἶτα τῶν Γιγάντων ἕκαστον δεχομένη καθ' ἓνα τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ παραδοίῃ δολοφονεῖν ἐξ ἀπάτης, which might conceivably provide a starting-point for the Cecryphes (1064). Tomaschek in *Pauly-Wissowa* identifies the Arsopes (1063) with the Aorsi, a great Sarmatian wandering tribe round the north of Maeotis, the Caspian, and the Tanais, mentioned by Strabo (XI. 492) and Tacitus (*Ann.* XII. 15, 16). In line 1073 the Πακτοί suggest proximity to the Frozen Sea, the Ἀρκτοί or Ἀρκτεῖοι to the north. I wonder whether the word Λελιών might conceal the great Scythian tribe of the Neuri (Hdt. IV. 105). The Gymnosophists of India might be responsible for the Gymni of line 1045.

But all such identifications are, perhaps, less probable than the other possibility, that these tribes—particularly the groups in lines 1045 and 1073—are simply

The children of an idle brain

Begot of nothing but vain fantasy.

In 1075 the Tauri are too far north. I think a possible reason for this is that their epithet ἀνδροφάγοι conceals the Scythian tribe called Ἀνδροφάγοι (Hdt. IV. 18 and 106), for whose position this would not be far wrong. The Nomads by their nature might be anywhere. But what are the Caspians doing so far from their eponymous sea? After this Orpheus is in regions confessedly fabulous. The Cronian Sea appears in almost exactly these terms in Dionysius Periegetes 31-33:

πρὸς βορέην, ἵνα παῖδες ἀρειμανέων Ἀριμάσπων
πόντον μιν καλέουσι πεπηγότα τε Κρόνιον τε·
ἄλλοι δ' αὖ καὶ νεκρὸν ἐφήμισαν εἶναι ἀφανροῦ | ἡελίου.

It might be the Gulf of Riga, which would be accessible down the river Dwina.

The Macrobian are described as though they were the Hyperboreans of Pindar or Pliny (VI. 89 sqq.). Eustathius, commenting on Dion. P. 557-9, says that some identify the two. But Orpheus is not one of these, since he enumerates the Hyperboreans separately (1077, 1082). Orphic colour is strong in this passage (1105-1118), which may be compared with the Orphic fragment (Kern, fr. 222) of a ἱερὸς λόγος describing the life of the Blest.

The Cimmerians (1120) are interesting because the precision of their placing wrecks the whole claim of the itinerary to an Arctic character. They are in a position in which the rising sun is barred from them by the Rhipaeon Mountain and Κάλπιος αὐχὴν, whatever they may be. The southern sky is similarly darkened by Phlegra, which may be Pallene (the other claimants for the name are plains), and the sharp-peaked Alps hide the evening light.

Not even the most obliging credulity can believe that this Κάλπιος αὐχὴν is the Rock of Gibraltar. There are three other possible explanations of it:

(1) That Orpheus is exerting too ostentatiously his motive power over mountains, as he does at 465 supra with Athos and Pallene, or, in other words, that he has made a gross mistake. This is very likely.

(2) That he is using a name which means something to him, but not to us, as with many tribes above.

(3) That the word should perhaps be Κάσπιος. Strabo II. 91 and 92 and XI. 497 uses such a name for the part of the Caucasus that is nearest the Caspian Sea.

Be Κάλπιος αὐχὴν what it may, the screens on the south and west seem to locate the Cimmerians somewhere in the region of Pannonia—say in the upper waters of the Ister. This supports—or rather is supported by—the suggestion made by Mr. Seltman in 1928 (*C.Q.* XXII., pp. 155 sqq.) that the original home of the Hyperboreans was in the Danube valley. This would suggest the Carpathians as equivalent to the Rhipaeae Mountain. When one remembers that Apollonius also has a Cronian Sea, but at the head of the Adriatic, the suspicion that Orpheus' Argonauts did not go so far north as he asserts is strengthened.

It gains further support from another persuasive identification. Dottin, in his recently published edition of this poem, regards Hermioneia as an island off Britain mentioned by Plutarch and Pliny. But there was another Hermione, or Hermion, in the Argolid, which was described by Strabo (VIII. 373) and Pausanias. Dottin refers to Strabo, but does not mention—and so presumably has not noticed—Pausanias, who gives food for thought. His Hermion is, it is true, anything but *χθαμαλή καὶ εὖβοτος*, but its surroundings are very significant. According to him (II. xxxiv.) the sightseer approached from Troezen, passing two separate sanctuaries of Demeter and her daughter the Maid, and some islands, of which one is called Pityussa (Pine-tree Island). When the Orphic Argonauts leave Hermioneia they pass *νήσον πευκήεσσαν ἰδ' εὐρέα δώματ' ἀνάσσης | Δήμητρος* (1189, 1190). Further, Pausanias' Hermion has in its neighbourhood two chasms, which were fabled to be the entrance to Hades, through one of which Dionysius made his *κατάβασις εἰς Ἄϊδον* to fetch up Semele, which was a canonical part of Orphic tradition; through the other, they said, Herakles dragged up Cerberus. Strabo adds a further detail in VIII. 373:

παρ' Ἑρμιονείσιν δὲ τεθρύληται τὴν εἰς Ἄϊδον κατάβασιν σύντομον εἶναι (they have a short cut)· *διόπερ οὐκ ἐντιθέασιν ἐνταῦθα τοῖς νεκροῖς ναῦλον*.

This ναῦλος is Charon's fee (cf. *Ar. Ran.* 270, XA. *ἐκβαίν'*, *ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον*).

At line 1139 the MSS. of the *Orphic Argonautica* read *ἀποφθιμένοισιν ἅλεις ναῦς ἱα τέτυκται* (auxquels à leur mort un seul navire suffit—Dottin). I know of no evidence suggesting that any place, however unjust its inhabitants (cf. 1138), needed a fleet of ferry-boats to convey its dead. Hermann, in view of the passage of Strabo, conjectured *ἄνεσις ναύλοιο* instead of *ἅλεις ναῦς ἱα*. I myself am very strongly attracted by that reading, but I do not base the identification on that alone. There are two other points which support it:

(1) In Pausanias II. xxxi. there appears between Troezen and Hermion a river *Χρυσορόας*, which never runs dry. I suggest that this river reappears in *O.A.* 1131 as the epithet applied to Acheron—*χρυσορόης*. Orpheus has here, I think, done as I suggested he did with the *Ταῦροι ἀνδροφάγοι* at 1075, and has attached one proper name to another as an epithet. Or it may have been done before him, since Pluto's stream is *χρυσόρροντον* in *P.V.* 805-6, and in Kern, fr. 222, the Blessed are located *ἐν καλῷ λειμῶνι βαθύρροον ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντα*. This process seems muddle-headed, but not so blatantly so as making a gold-flowing river roll down water like silver. That might, however, be mechanical—Orpheus' rivers are apt to be either loud-roaring or silvery (cf. Aesepus at 488).

(2) In *O.A.* 1150 Ancaeus cheers his comrades by telling them *ἀκραῇ Ζέφυρον καταδέρκομαι*. This would be a fatal circumstance if they were really trying to leave the Baltic or to round Europe from north to west; but it is just what they want to speed them on from Argolis towards Thessaly.

There is another detail in Pausanias which deserves notice, though it does not bear directly on the Argonauts. That is the observation at II. xxxi. 10—that it was at Troezen that Herakles cut the club from the wild olive tree which he discovered beside the Saronic Sea. Another discovery of trees by Herakles is located by Pindar in the land of the Hyperboreans, when his quest of the hind drove him to the Istrian

land (*Ol.* III. 26). And we may remember that it was to Lerna's deep meadow that Io was sent by her dreams to meet Zeus (*P.V.* 652-3). All these scattered details seem to point to the fact that that small corner of Greece was a centre of ancient lore, and make it possible that stories originated there, whose events were afterwards located further afield.

The conclusion I would draw from all this is that Orpheus has more reason than confusion of mind or perverse ingenuity for making his Hermioneia indistinguishable from the Argolic Hermion—that he has as his foundation a much older and much shorter version of the route, which took the Argonauts up the Phasis into Lake Maeotis among the tribes of Scythia, up the Ister, down the Adriatic, and round the Peloponnese. Such a route might have served as a basis for Apollonius. It is noticeable that the Orphic Argonauts reach the Rhipaeian Mountains and the Northern Ocean suspiciously soon after passing the Androphagi. The trip from Maeotis to the Cronian Sea takes them in all nine days, rowing night and day. They reach the Rhipaeian Mountains on the tenth dawn. (The return journey takes twelve days to the Pillars of Herakles.) Herodotus' hearsay information extended for twelve days' journey up the Borysthenes, and the *Ἀνδροφάγοι* were beyond it. The only place in the *Argonautica* demonstrably north of this is Ierne, which seems to be derived, like the Cronian Sea, from Dionysius Periegetes.

There is support for this suggestion in two other places:

(1) Sophocles' lost play *Scythae*, which dealt with the Argonauts (see Pearson's introduction), seems to have located the slaying of Apsyrtus not at the mouth of the Ister as Apollonius did, but in Scythia. The Tanais also came into it in some way (*fr.* 548), and even the few and small surviving fragments provide two words which are encouraging. In 548 he has the phrase *ἐπακτίας αἰλῶνας*. *αἰλῶν* is used three times in *O.A.* at 206, 747 and 1079, and occurs also in *P.V.* 731 *λιποῦσαν αἰλῶν* *ἐκπερὰν Μαιωτικόν* and in Aristophanes, *Birds*, 244. It is not a very common word: I suggest they all remember the original Orphic poem. The other word is from Hesychius, *βυθίζων*, and recalls *βυθός*, which I mentioned above.

I do not, however, think that Apsyrtus was killed in Scythia in the old Orphic poem, but in Colchis, as in *O.A.* 1031. A fragment of Pherecydes (*F.H.G.* i. 89) attests the existence of this version in the sixth century B.C., and it is a detail which would hardly be added *after* Apollonius, since the tendency would be to enhance rather than to diminish the sensational.

(2) The other place is near the premature end of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*, which terminates abruptly too soon to make it certain what homeward route he favoured. But at VIII. 207-11 he has

illam (sc. Medeam) Sarmatici miserantur litora ponti,
illa Thoanteae transit defleta Dianae.
nulla palus, nullus Scythiae non maeret euntem | amnis.

If these lines do not refer to a passage by Maeotis and the north coast of the Euxine they seem to have no meaning.

I suggest, in short, a *contaminatio* of two versions of different antiquity:

(1) An old Orphic narrative belonging to the period of the 'Reisebeschreibungen' and comprising Phasis (cf. Hesiod ap. Schol. Ap. Rh. IV. 284), Maeotis, the north coast of the Euxine, possibly Ister, the Adriatic and the Peloponnese. I think that this was the source which provided inspiration and quasi-information for a very much more distinguished successor—the passage describing Io's wandering in the *Prometheus Vincitus*. That description provides thirteen coincidences in vocabulary and geography with the geographical passages of the *Argonautica*.

(2) A pseudo-geographical account perhaps suggested by Diodorus or the authorities to whom he refers and enriched by the writer of the fourth century A.D. from his studies of Herodotus, Strabo, Dionysius Periegetes and, if not Mela and Pliny, their Greek sources. That Orpheus read Diodorus is suggested by a coincidence of detail: Diod. IV. 56 says they proceeded *τὴν γῆν ἔχοντας ἐξ εὐωνύμου*, while

Orpheus at 1085 records that Ancaeus steered them ἐπὶ δεξιὸν αἰγιαλοῖο. Little stress can be laid on this, since common sense would dictate it to anyone who possessed that faculty; but I am not sure that Orpheus did.

Of these two versions the new one predominates so long as his geographical authorities provide material, but when he reaches the bounds of the known world the old text gains the upper hand. But it has left traces of itself even before this, in the χεύμασιν ἀπλήτοισι of 1051, in πύματον δὲ βυθοῦ διαμείψαμεν ὕδωρ of 1066 (διαμείβειν is purely Aeschylean—*P.V.* 285, *Theb.* 334, *Supp.* 540 and *Fr.* 150), in the confusion between the Tauri and the Androphagi in 1073, the Tauri being of the old, the Androphagi of the new dispensation. The frozen sea was, I think, common to both versions, but differently located. As it has come down to us, it is clearly from Dionysius Periegetes; but there was no need to go so far afield for it—

Lo, where Maeotis sleeps, and hardly flows
The freezing Tanais through a waste of snows—

Ovid and Strabo (VII. 307) establish the claims of Maeotis and the Scythian waters to the title νεκρὴ θάλασσα. The likelihood that the epithet Κρόνιος is a real old Orphic survival is supported by the passage in Pindar, *Ol.* II. 68 sqq., where it is said that οἶσοι ἐτόλμασαν ἑστρίς . . . ἔστειλαν Διὸς ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν, where the Islands of the Blest lie. It is possible also that the direct borrowings from Homer, like 1143, had been made by the original poet.

Pomponius Mela, who had some reason to know, said that geography was 'impeditum opus et facundiae minime capax.' Orpheus thought it easy; but it was an obstacle which tripped him over and over again. But this may be forgiven him, since his ineptitudes point the way to what I hope is a true interpretation. If it is, it opens the possibility that the rest of the poem is contaminated in the same way. The patchiness noticed at first may be so capable of explanation. But the bulk of that investigation is still to be made, and it may very likely seem μακρὸν τὸ δεῦρο πέλαγος οὐδὲ πλωσιμόν.

J. R. BACON.

GIRTON COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

HOMODYNE IN THE FOURTH FOOT OF THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER.¹

I.

It is sufficiently probable that quantitative scansion in Latin, imposed on a language in which accentuation by stress was alone significant originally, not only gave way to the earlier principle in the decline of Latin literature, but scarcely tended to suppress it at any time in common speech and in familiar writing.² It is also probable therefore that even in literature dominated by quantity stress-accentuation was not obliterated altogether. In fact the incidences of it, in Vergilian verse at least, seemed so characteristic that in late Antiquity the Vergilian stress-rhythms were apparently copied without any knowledge of the prosody of the hexameter.³ In modern expositions, the variety of Vergil's rhythms is generally referred, not only to scansion, but also to stress-accentuation: and it has recently been shown that lines in which stress and metrical ictus predominantly coincide are different in quality and expressiveness from lines in which they do not.⁴ Since however no general explanation or definition of this difference in quality seemed to have been offered, I lately attempted a simple theory which would account for the different aesthetic values of lines of these two classes, and which would define, if possible, what these different values are.⁵

In the hexameter there must be at least two different wave-frequencies, of stress and of ictus. Their impulses must either coincide on the same syllables, or they must be in opposition: but they must in either event combine to produce the resultant movement of the finished hexameter. I therefore chose the analogy of wireless telegraphy. In the wireless receiving apparatus, a locally generated wave, different in frequency, is superimposed on the incoming wave from the transmitting station. This is necessary, because frequency high enough for transmission is too high for reception, but it is possible by combining two waves to produce a third wave of much lower frequency than either of the other two. The frequency of this third wave is governed by the coincidences of the peaks, recurring at regular intervals, of the two waves from which it results. In the hexameter there are also two waves, and they may there also, if they do not coincide at every peak, combine to produce a third wave of lower frequency than either. Therefore, when stress and ictus, regarded as the peaks of two waves, do not coincide, the movement of the hexameter is restricted. The analogy of wireless telegraphy suggested the terms *homodyne* for the coincidence of stress and ictus, and *heterodyne* for opposition between the two forces: but of course these terms do not imply the necessity of the analogy, for they are etymologically appropriate to any circumstance in which impulses of energy are combined or opposed.

¹ I acknowledge gratefully the encouragement and criticism of Mr. J. D. Denniston, without which this article would probably not have been written.

² There is good evidence in the history of the clausula: for the references see A. C. Clark, *Fontes Prosae Numerosae*, bibliography, *ad fin.*, and W. H. Shewring in *C.Q.* XXIV. (1930), pp. 164 sqq., and XXV. (1931), pp. 12 sqq.; and for an appreciation of results, His Grace the Archbishop of York, in *Proc. Class. Ass.* XXVII. (1930), pp. 24-26.

³ By Commodianus, cited by Sir Henry New-

bolt, *A New Study of English Poetry*, pp. 34 sqq.; where the beauty and importance of stress-rhythms in Vergil are well recognized.

⁴ By Mr. F. R. Dale in *C.R.* XLIII. (1929), pp. 165, 166. But Professor H. J. Rose informs me that some slight researches of his own, undertaken a score of years ago and never published, indicated that the verse of Vergil was more 'heterodyned' (see below) than that of the early poets (Ennius and Lucretius) on the one hand, and of Ovid and Lucan on the other.

⁵ *Latin Teaching*, XIII. (1930), pp. 37 sqq.

The qualities required by the analogy are in fact apparent in the hexameter. A homodyned verse has freedom, and unless other influences retard it, speed :

impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit (Verg. *Ecl.* I. 70).¹

A heterodyned verse on the other hand is constricted by the internal opposition : it has *reluctance*, in the sense available by a change in the electrical metaphor : and unless other influences hasten it, its movement is slow :

erramus uento huc uastis et fluctibus acti (Verg. *Aen.* I. 333),

expediunt fessi rerum, frugesque receptas (Verg. *Aen.* I. 178).

From these instances, and perhaps still more from

illi inter sese multa ui brachia tollunt (Verg. *Aen.* VIII. 452),

monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum (Verg. *Aen.* III. 658),

of which both are equally spondaic, but the first is heterodyned and the second homodyned, two principles seem to emerge : first, that the proportion of dactyls and spondees cannot account for the whole effect of freedom or constriction : and second, that the rhythm thus explained may be appropriate to the sense of the verse.² Of these principles, the first is unlikely to be denied, although it depends ultimately on the immediate recognition of the quality of the rhythm. The second can be supported by many examples, but not by statistical proportion, because it can hardly be affirmed that the sense will always be enforced by the rhythmic instrument. In Verg. *Ecl.* I. 70 the speaker's unrestrained indignation is matched by the unrestraint of the verse : in Verg. *Aen.* I. 178 and 333 there is weariness and frustration, both in the rhythm and in the sense of the words : in Verg. *Aen.* VIII. 452 there is in both modes effort and conflict : in Verg. *Aen.* III. 658, resistlessness. Sometimes however, even when conflict is not appropriate to the sense of a line, heterodyne can still help the meaning, because the effect of heterodyne includes a reduction of speed : so that a solemn, slowly moving line is frequently heterodyned, although conflict and constriction of texture are not required by the meaning for their own sake : as in

obstupuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido (Verg. *Aen.* I. 613),

tune ille Aeneas quem Dardanio Anchisae (Verg. *Aen.* I. 617),

where there is repression of impulse in surprise : and

prospiciens summa placidum caput extulit unda (Verg. *Aen.* I. 127),

where the calm confidence of Neptunus (in a dactylic but heterodyned verse) is contrasted with the recent violence of the storm, described in such rhythms as

una Eurusque Notusque ruunt creberque procellis

Africus . . . (Verg. *Aen.* I. 85, 86).

But the analysis of these directly expressional effects of texture is not the purpose of this paper. I intend here to examine generally occurrences of homodyne and heterodyne in the fourth foot of the Vergilian hexameter. The fourth foot seems cardinal for the differentiation of lines by texture, because the weight of the verse

¹ A good example, cited by Mr. F. R. Dale (*C.R.* XLIII. (1929), p. 166).

² How much the *freedom* of homodyne contributes with the natural *pace* of dactylic metre to give rapidity to poetry is shown well by a comparison between *Aen.* I. 81-91 and *Aen.* I. 712-722, two passages each of eleven lines. In the first (81-91) there are thirty dactyls and forty-two homodyne incidences ; and in the second twenty-seven dactyls but only twenty-eight homodyne

incidences. Although the numbers of dactyls are nearly the same, the first passage (81-91) is much more rapid, because the homodyne gives freedom to it. The same passage (81-91) is also a very good example of the adaptation of texture by homodyne and heterodyne to sense, to give either freedom, or constriction and conflict, where the sense requires them. Cf. p. 186, note 2.

falls within its second half, and because the texture of the other two feet in the second half of the verse is nearly constant. I give statistics of the absolute occurrences of homodyne and heterodyne in the fourth foot, and also of the distribution of them in certain formations. It often appears that the importance of fourth-foot texture is structural, concerned with the mechanics of Epic construction: for patterns of fourth-foot homodyne may help to combine several verses together into a larger organic unit. The classification by the terms expressional and structural is of course provisional and arbitrary, because, since the form of poetry exists in the service of its content, structural formations ultimately serve an expressional purpose. I have therefore indicated shortly what seem to me to be the direct expressional effects of homodyne and heterodyne in any part of a verse, whenever it is possible to detect these effects in operation.

II.

Fourth-foot homodyne is by comparison rare in Vergil, but not very rare. The percentage¹ of it to the total number of lines in the *Aeneid* is 35.95 per cent. The *Eclogues* show 37.27 per cent. and the *Georgics* 33.45 per cent. Vergil's highest figure is 50 per cent. in *Ecl. VI.*, and his lowest 28.61 per cent. in *Aen. I.* The variation within the *Aeneid* is not great: from *Aen. I.* 28.61 per cent. to *Aen. VIII.* 39.97 per cent. No other book falls below X. 32.59 per cent. The variation within the *Georgics* is very small indeed: from III. 32.51 per cent. to I. 35.16 per cent. With the Vergilian figures I compare figures for other poets and for the *Appendix Vergiliana*. The proportion of fourth-foot homodyne in the *Aeneid* is a little less than half-way between the lowest proportion which I have recorded, Ps.-Tibullus IV. 1 23.28 per cent., and the highest, Catullus LXIV. 61.25 per cent. Lucretius I. 51.49 per cent., Ovid *Met. I.* 48.91 per cent. and Lucan *Phars. I.* 41.16 per cent. have higher figures than Vergil, and Valerius Flaccus *Argon. I.* 26.5 per cent.,² a lower, The *Appendix Vergiliana* varies between *Lydia* 25 per cent. and (to exclude *Est et non Dirae* 46.6 per cent.

These figures admit some comment. The widest divergence lies between Ps.-Tibullus and Catullus, both near to Vergil in time. But in the work of Vergil and in the *Appendix Vergiliana* there is a steady tendency to some uniformity at a figure between 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. The changeable tone of the *Eclogues*, and their shortness, which gives perhaps some play to chance, may account for the wide variation in their figures. It would appear in fact that consciously or unconsciously the poets of the time were experimenting with the texture of the second half of the hexameter, to give, by development in either direction, flexibility to the technique which Lucretius had achieved. Vergil probably found the fittest proportion in the *Georgics* and in *Aen. VI.* But he exceeded it sometimes significantly, either by chance or design: most notably in *Aen. VIII.* 39.97 per cent., where the rhythmic structure

¹ In determining the incidence of stress-accent, I have of course assumed the truth of the law of the penultima. I have tried to pursue a consistent practice—if perhaps to some extent inevitably conventional—according to the canon given by F. W. Westaway, *Quantity and Accent in Latin*, pp. 67 sqq. Plenum opus aleae: but there is some reassurance in the circumstance that the figures of absolute fourth-foot homodyne for the whole *Aeneid* varied in two computations, in which different texts were used and different conventions followed, by 0.45 per cent. only. I have compiled statistics from the works of Vergil (Hirtzel), the *Appendix Vergiliana* (Ellis: except *Aetna*, Haupt), and, for comparison, from Lucretius *De Rerum Natura* I. (Bailey), Catullus *Carm.*

LXIV. (Haupt), Ps.-Tibullus IV. 1 (Haupt), Ovid *Met. I.* (Weise), Lucan *Phars. I.* (Housman), and Valerius Flaccus *Argon. I.* (Kramer). I include Ps.-Tibullus IV. 1, in spite of the improbability that the poem is the work of Tibullus himself, and of the uncertain merit of the poetry, because the probable date of its composition gives interest to the comparison with Vergil's usage, and because this poem presents rhythmical qualities which are exceptional.

² The usages of rhythmic texture exhibited by Valerius Flaccus are not unlike the Vergilian. But though they have restraint and power, they lack expressive flexibility: cf. the storm-passages in Verg. *Aen. I.* 81-123 and in Val. Flacc. *Argon. I.* 574-658.

is poor,
artistica
referable
elaborat
sound co
of fourth
Vergilian

For
potentia
this qu
texture
require
of a ne
foot of

but it
caesura

F
phatic
70.69
35.95
a simp

When
in a re

The p
cent.,
Culex
61.25,
the o
Phars.
at all
IV. 1

I
wheth
seems
this h
did n
prefe

¹ Es
Classi
where
also i

is poor, and in *Aen.* II., where it seems to be finely adjusted to render quick but artistically balanced movement. *Aen.* I, 28·61 per cent. has a strangely low figure: referable perhaps to expressional intentions, for the rhythms of the book are often elaborate. It is of some interest that Catullus LXIV., which contains so many sound complexes and phrases which were echoed by Vergil,¹ should show a proportion of fourth-foot homodyne so different from the Vergilian. The figures for the *Appendix Vergiliana* may possibly prove relevant to discussions of authorship.

III.

Fourth-foot homodyne tends to give a release and freedom, and therefore potential acceleration, at the end of a verse. It is sometimes possible to see how this quality can vitalize the structure of epic poetry. It is clear that variation of texture may afford a certain elasticity, and a new impulse of power when it is required. This effect, of a strong impulse of power, may be noticed at the beginning of a new motive, when initial homodyne—coincidence of stress and ictus in the first foot of the hexameter—is significantly applied:

haec ubi dicta, cauum conuersa cuspidem montem (Verg. *Aen.* I. 81):

but it is apparent also when fourth-foot homodyne follows a definite pause² at a caesura in the third foot:

illi agmine certo
Laocoonta petunt; et primum parua duorum
corpora natorum . . . (Verg. *Aen.* II. 212-214).

For Vergil, fourth-foot homodyne in such divided lines predominates emphatically. The statistics—*Eclogues* 57·96 per cent., *Georgics* 71·6 per cent., *Aeneid* 70·69 per cent., compared with the absolute respective figures of 37·27, 33·45, and 35·95 per cent.—amount to a demonstration of preference: especially since often a simple transposition would have secured heterodyne: as in

stat ductis sortibus urna (Verg. *Aen.* VI. 22),
cum uirgo 'poscere fata . . .' (Verg. *Aen.* VI. 45).

When the fourth foot of a divided line is heterodyned, there is often sufficient cause in a required sadness, solemnity, or slowness of pace:

facilis iactura sepulchri (Verg. *Aen.* II. 646),
sequimur te, sancte deorum (Verg. *Aen.* IV. 576).

The preference is found also in Lucretius I. 80 per cent., Catullus LXIV. 87·5 per cent., Ovid *Met.* I. 70·27 per cent., Valerius Flaccus *Argon.* I. 61·76 per cent., *Culex* 64·29 per cent., *Aetna* 60 per cent. (the absolute respective figures being 51·49, 61·25, 48·91, 26·5, 35·59, 34·36 per cent.): proportions not unlike the Vergilian. On the other hand, the figures for fourth-foot homodyne in divided lines in Lucan *Phars.* I. 42·45 per cent., *Ciris* 44·4 per cent., *Dirae* 40 per cent. preponderate little or not at all over the absolute respective figures 41·16, 42·14, 46·6 per cent. In Ps.-Tibullus IV. 1 there is only one such divided line, and it is heterodyned in the fourth foot.

I infer that fourth-foot homodyne in divided lines was sought by many poets, whether consciously, or unconsciously by ear; but not by all: that Vergil, who seems to refuse more often than the others transpositions which might have evaded this homodyne, sought it consciously: and that Lucan at least, perhaps because he did not wish to emphasize any check at any point in the hexameter, intentionally preferred heterodyne. The figures of the *Eclogues*, which vary from 40 to 85·71 per

¹ Especially in *Ed.* IV. (E. Marion Smith in *Classical Journal* XXVI. (1930), pp. 141-143), where the influence of Catullus is to be discerned also in the metre and metrical typology, but

scarcely in the fourth-foot texture.

² By a definite pause I mean the existence or possibility of a punctuation at least as strong as a semicolon, or of the first of a pair of brackets.

cent., but which all show a preference, relatively to absolute figures, for homodyne, and perhaps also of the *Appendix Vergiliana*, may suggest rhythmical experiment. The proportion in *Culex*, 64.29 per cent., is again Vergilian, like the absolute figure of 35.59 per cent. for it. The figures of *Ciris* 44.4 per cent. and *Dirae* 40 per cent. are definitely not Vergilian, in comparison with the absolute 42.14 and 46.6 per cent. The comparative proportions of *Dirae* (40 per cent. to an absolute 46.6 per cent.) and *Lydia* (42.86 per cent. to an absolute 25 per cent.) may seem to confirm the decision that these pieces are two poems, not two parts of one.

IV.

Since a preference in some sense for fourth-foot homodyne in at least one place, the divided line, is exceedingly probable, it is unlikely that elsewhere the occurrences of it will always be arbitrary or fortuitous. In a great number of verses, of Vergil at least, the expressional function is dominant: but that would require separate treatment. It may be possible, however, to discern certain structural principles, which seem sometimes to be used to bind hexameter lines together into longer units.¹ Two principles provide a sufficient provisional classification: from them secondary usages are often deducible.

The first of these principles I call the *released movement*. By *movement* I understand a unit of expression and rhythm, contained in three or more verses, but hardly in more than ten, and normally confined between strong punctuations between verses, at which thought and rhythm naturally come to rest. A *released movement* is then a movement in which the rhythm is steadily maintained by fourth-foot heterodyne until the last verse, in which the fourth foot is homodyned. The effect is easily to be recognized. A kind of rhythmic force is generated and pent, to be released in the last line. A very good example is the first section² of the *Aeneid*:

arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris	~
Italiam fato profugus Lauinaque uenit	~
litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto	~
ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,	~
multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem	~
inferretque deos Latio, genus unde Latinum	~
Albanique patres, atque altae moenia Romae.	/

(Verg. *Aen.* I. 1-7.)

Released movements are generally shorter. The most common are of three or four lines:

¹ For the complexity of the Vergilian technique cf. C. M. Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, p. 66: 'It (the Homeric hexameter) existed too early for an elaborate structure of lines to be used, such as, for instance, we find in Vergilian hexameters': and, for a possible parallel to the conception of texture and pattern in Latin verse, cf. Edith Sitwell, *Collected Poems* (preface): 'The poems in "Façade" and some of the songs in "Prelude to a Fairy Tale" are technical experiments—studies in the effect that texture has on rhythm, and the effect that varying and elaborate patterns of rhymes and of assonances have upon rhythm.' Of this theory the suggestions of the present paper are independent.

² The metrical fabric of this passage has been discussed already. 'But the most famous and familiar example of this *tour de force* in blending

two passages into one was discovered by Nettleship and published in his "Additional Notes" in the third volume of Conington's *Vergil*. The opening of the *Aeneid* recalls in its substance the opening of the *Odyssey*, *ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ*, but the rhythm and general structure of the first seven lines are taken from the same number of lines at the opening of the *Iliad*, so that the first two and the last lines of each group are precisely similar in metre' (H. R. Fairclough, in *C.P.* XXV. (1930), pp. 45, 46). In such careful and elaborate passages harmonious effects of stress-incidence also are generally apparent.

In the citations which follow, I indicate fourth-foot homodyne by the sign / and fourth-foot heterodyne by the sign ~, placed in the margin opposite to the line concerned.

HOMODYNE IN FOURTH FOOT OF VERGILIAN HEXAMETER 189

sacra Dionaeae matri diuisque ferebam ~
 auspicibus coeptorum operum, superoque nitentem ~
 caelicolum regi mactabam in litore taurum. /
 (Verg. *Aen.* III. 19-21.)
 ecce autem flammis inter tabulata uolutus ~
 ad caelum undabat uertex turrimque tenebat, ~
 turrim compactis trabibus quam eduxerat ipse ~
 subdideratque rotas pontisque instraerat altos. /
 (Verg. *Aen.* XII. 672-675.)

The classification includes movements of which the first verse is homodyned in the fourth foot, provided that there are at least two lines of fourth-foot heterodyne before the last line of the movement:

ipsa ego te, medios cum sol accenderit aestus, /
 cum sitiunt herbae et pecori iam gratior umbra est, ~
 in secreta senis ducam, quo fessus ab undis ~
 se recipit, facile ut somno adgrediare iacentem. /
 (Verg. *Georg.* IV. 401-404.)

There seems to be a slight tendency to start in the next line after a released movement with a fourth-foot homodyne: so that the new movement appears to begin again where the last ended, and to be clamped together with it by two lines in this respect similar:

labitur uncta uadis abies, mirantur et undae, ~
 miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe ~
 scuta uirum fluuiio pictasque innare carinas. /
 olli remigio noctemque diemque fatigant /
 et longos superant flexus . . . ~
 (Verg. *Aen.* VIII. 91-95.)

(Cf. Verg. *Aen.* I. 18, 19: 91, 92: 112, 113: 226, 227: 260, 261: 458, 459: etc.)

Two or more released movements may be built together into a longer structure:

poma quoque, ut primum truncos sensere ualentis ~
 et uiris habuere suas, ad sidera raptim ~
 ui propria nituntur opisque haud indiga nostrae. /
 nec minus interea fetu nemus omne grauescit, ~
 sanguineisque inculta rubent auaria baxis. ~
 tondentur cytisi, taedas silua alta ministrat, ~
 pascunturque ignes nocturni et lumina fundunt. /
 (Verg. *Georg.* II. 426-432.)

Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna ~
 praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo ~
 insuetum per iter gelidas enauit ad arctos, ~
 Chalcidicaque leuis tandem super adstitit arce. ~
 redditus his primum terris tibi, Phoebe, sacrauit ~
 remigium alarum, posuitque immania templa. /
 in foribus letum Androgeo; tum pendere poenas ~
 Cecropidae iussi (miserum) septena quot annis ~
 corpora natorum; stat ductis sortibus urna. /
 contra elata mari respondet Gnosia tellus: ~
 hic crudelis amor tauri suppostaque furto ~
 Minotaurus inest, Veneris monimenta nefandae; ~
 hic labor ille domus et inextricabilis error; /
 (Verg. *Aen.* VI. 14-27.)

Here the divisions between the movements as units of thought are not so sharp as the divisions between them as units of rhythm. Thus the pauses, and especially the pause after the semicolon at the end, are not emphatic; and there is an effect of maintained suspense, necessary at the beginning of the Sixth *Aeneid*.

There are 464 released movements in the work of Vergil: and the statistics narrowly justify a statement that released movements are characteristically Vergilian. I give them in pairs of figures, the first of which represent the average numbers of released movements which occur in each hundred lines, and the second the percentages of lines which are comprised in released movements. Except for *Moretum* 4·84/16·96 per cent., the *Aeneid* 3·7/15·75 per cent. shows definitely the highest figures. The *Georgics* 3·53/14·65 per cent. are next, with *Culex* 3·63/13·56 per cent. Lucan *Phars.* I. 3·19/12·46 per cent., Ovid *Met.* I. 3·08/12·58 per cent., Valerius Flaccus *Argon.* I. 2·94/13·07 per cent., *Dirae* 2·91/12·62 per cent., are not far from the figures of the *Aeneid* and of the *Georgics*. The lower figures of the *Eclogues* 2·66/9·77 per cent. are paralleled in *Aetna* 2·41/9·75 per cent. and *Ciris* 1·85/7·39 per cent. Lucretius I. 1·49/5·49 per cent., Catullus LXIV. 0·73/2·7 per cent., and Ps.-Tibullus IV. i. 0·47/2·89 per cent., seem to have proportions significantly lower still. Individual books and poems of Vergil show considerable variation—between *Ec.* VII. 0, IX. 0, III. 1·8/7·21 per cent., and *Ec.* X. 6·49/23·38 per cent., *Aen.* VI. 5·12/21·36 per cent. The next highest are *Georg.* III. 4·24/18·02 per cent., and *Georg.* IV. 4·06/17·67 per cent., *Aen.* VII. 4·07/17·51 per cent. The variation within the *Georgics* lies between I. 2·53/8·95 per cent. and III. 4·24/18·02 per cent.: and within the *Aeneid* between II. 2·39/10·06 per cent., VIII. 2·61/10·99 per cent., and VI. 5·12/21·36 per cent.

It is to be suspected, from the increase in number of released movements, that this technique came into favour during Vergil's early years, and was developed by Vergil himself and by his contemporaries. In Lucretius I. 1·49/5·49 per cent., Catullus LXIV. 0·73/2·7 per cent., Ps.-Tibullus IV. i. 0·47/2·89 per cent. released movements are so rare that they are probably fortuitous, although it is possible that Lucretius occasionally favoured them, apprehending them sometimes by ear, without analysing the effect. The *Appendix Vergiliana* and the *Eclogues* contain poems which seem to disclose experiment. There is a development towards the practice of the *Aeneid*. *Culex* is again Vergilian. Within the work of Vergil the statistics for *Aen.* II., VI., VIII. invite comment. *Aen.* II. 2·39/10·06 per cent., VIII. 2·61/10·99 per cent. have almost equally the lowest figures, but the rhythms of II. seem to be satisfying and perhaps delicate and elaborate, whereas the rhythms of much of Book VIII., until the last part of the book where they are perceptibly enriched again, seem comparatively poor and weak. It is possible that the fierce story of *Aen.* II. is unfit for the governed pace of released movements, and that other schematics hard to analyse were chosen instead. On the other hand, it is scarcely possible to deny that released movements, sometimes constructed together into long periods, give grandeur to *Aen.* VI. Vergil's usage in the released movement seems to have been followed by his successors, though his usage in absolute fourth-foot homodyne and in the fourth-foot homodyne of divided lines was not quite followed. But Lucan especially and Ovid also are yet comparatively unsuccessful in their application: perhaps because their hexameters are too dactylic and too much homodyned in the first foot, and therefore lack weight: and Lucan also because he can seldom achieve a compact unit of thought and rhythm, so that many of his released movements are scarcely released movements at all.¹ Vergil excels, besides,

¹ E.g. Lucan *Phars.* I. 564-567:

... matremque suos conterruit infans;
diraque per populum Cumanae carmina uatis
uolgantur. tum, quos sectis Bellona lacertis
saeua mouet, cecinere deos, crinemque ro-
tantes

sanguineum populis ulularunt tristia Galli. /

—where the punctuation within the 'movement' is stronger than at the beginning. I have erred in the direction of including Lucan's questionable released movements in the computation.

HOMODYNE IN FOURTH FOOT OF VERGILIAN HEXAMETER 191

in his art of long constructions and in his choice of the moment at which each rhythmic artifice must be employed.

V.

My second rhythmic principle is the principle of alternation. By an *alternation* I mean a sequence of five or more hexameters alternately homodyned and heterodyned in their fourth feet: as:

nec non et uario noctem sermone trahebat	~
infelix Dido longumque bibebat amorem,	/
multa super Priamo rogicans, super Hectore multa;	~
nunc quibus Aurorae uenisset filius armis,	/
nunc quales Diomedis equi, nunc quantus Achilles.	~
'immo age et a prima dic, hospes, origine nobis	/
insidias' inquit 'Danaum casusque tuorum	~
erroresque tuos; nam te iam septima portat	/
omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus aestas.'	~

(Verg. *Aen.* I. 748-756.)

—the last lines of *Aen.* I., which begins with one of the most perfect released movements, and ends with one of the most perfect alternations, in the whole poem. The effect of this alternation is not difficult to apprehend. The pressure of energy is dispersed through the passage by alternate pulses, so that the dignity and solemn pace are sustained evenly. For Dido, the events of the evening are only a beginning: and therefore any rhythm with finality would have set too sharp a division between the first and second books. Other instances are frequent:

at gemini lapsu delubra ad summa dracones	/
effugiunt saeuaeque petunt Tritonidis arcem,	~
sub pedibusque deae clipeique sub orbe teguntur.	/
tum uero tremefacta nouus per pectora cunctis	~
insinuat pauor, et scelus expendisse merentem	/
Laocoonta ferunt, sacrum qui cuspidis robur	~
laeserit et tergo sceleratam intorserit hastam.	/

(Verg. *Aen.* II. 225-231.)

—where momentum is similarly maintained, but at higher rapidity. Both these alternations follow long sequences of fourth-foot heterodyne: and so a steady tenour gives way to elasticity and swing.

Alternations occur in the work of other poets than Vergil, and there is not a very great difference in general between the statistics for them and for him. I give the figures again in pairs, the first representing the average number of alternations which occur in each hundred lines, and the second the percentage of lines which are comprised within alternations. The general figures for the *Eclogues* 2.41/14.84 per cent., *Georgics* 2.7/15.6 per cent., *Aeneid* 2.34/14.32 per cent. have a certain constancy. Within the *Eclogues* there is a wide variation between VII. 0, X. 1.29/6.49 per cent. V. 1.1/6.6 per cent., and III. 4.5/30.63 per cent., I. 6.02/36.14 per cent. Within the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* there is less variation: between *Georg.* II. 2.58/14.06 per cent., IV. 2.47/13.6 per cent., and III. 3.18/18.2 per cent., and between *Aen.* I. 1.58/10.87 per cent., IV. 1.71/10.43 per cent., and III. 2.95/17.58 per cent., V. 2.77/17.32 per cent., XI. 2.96/17.63 per cent. Ps.-Tibullus IV. i. 5.68/36.49 per cent. and Ovid *Met.* I. 3.21/21.81 per cent. have high figures. Lucretius I. 2.39/16.18 per cent., *Aetna* 2.79/16.87 per cent. show proportions higher than the Vergilian average, to which, however, Catullus LXIV. 1.96/13.24 per cent., Valerius Flaccus *Argon* I. 2.36/12.13 per cent., *Culex* 1.93/12.83 per cent., *Ciris* 2.03/13.12 per cent. are near. The figures

for *Moretum* 0·814·03 per cent., *Dirae* 0·974·85 per cent., Lucan *Phars.* I. 1·59/9·57 per cent. are low.

The statistics are not altogether determinate, and it remains probable that many alternations are fortuitous. It is not, however, probable that they escaped the notice of all poets: for since it is likely that they were not all indifferent to fourth-foot homodyne and heterodyne in application to divided lines and in released movements, some at least of them must have been conscious of the alternations, whether or not they sought or excluded them deliberately. It is probable also that a tendency to experiment with alternations in the *Eclogues* and to control and to use them in the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* may be discovered: and perhaps, too, that Ps.-Tibullus and Ovid¹ found some satisfaction in them, although their admission of them often appears arbitrary. But in the work of Vergil it is hard to deny, after careful examination of them, that alternations are part of the technique, especially when their use clearly gives vitality to long epic narrative, when they are associated with

¹ E.g. Ovid *Mel.* I. 681-692, an effective alternation: generally, however, they tend to seem inorganic or frivolous.

TABLE OF FOURTH-FOOT HOMODYNE

	Eclogues—										Georgics—		
	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.	X.	Total.	II.	III.
Absolute fourth-foot homodyne per cent.	37'35	32'88	43'24	31'75	31'1	50	40	37'61	37'31	31'17	37'16	33'21	32'5
Divided lines	7	13	20	5	7	8	3	8	7	10	83	28	15
Fourth-foot homodyne in divided lines per cent.	85'71	53'85	60	40	42'86	87'5	0	62'5	42'86	60	57'23	82'14	66'3
Instances avoidable by transposition ...	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	0
Released movements per cent. of lines ...	3'61	4'11	1'8	3'17	2'2	3'49	0	1'83	0	6'49	2'53	3'32	4'2
Lines per cent. comprised in released movements	13'25	12'33	7'21	9'52	7'7	16'28	0	7'34	0	23'38	9'95	14'21	18'0
Alternations per cent. of lines	6'02	1'37	4'5	1'59	1'1	1'16	0	2'75	2'95	1'29	2'72	2'58	3'1
Lines per cent. comprised in alternations	36'14	6'85	30'63	7'94	6'6	8'14	0	16'51	19'4	6'49	14'51	14'06	18'2

OTHER POETIC POEMS.

	Lucretius <i>De Rerum Natura</i> I.	Catullus <i>Carm.</i> LXIV.	Ps.-Tibullus IV. 1.	Ovid <i>Mel.</i> I.	Lucan <i>Phars.</i> I.	Valerius Flaccus <i>Argon.</i> I.	Cuius.
Absolute fourth-foot homodyne per cent.	51·49	61·25	23·28	48·91	41·16	26·5	35·59
Divided lines	20	8	1	111	71	34	14
Fourth-foot homodyne in divided lines per cent.	80	87·5	0	70·27	42·25	61·76	64·29
Instances avoidable by transposition	5	1	0	5	0	5	1
Released movements per cent. of lines	1·49	0·73	0·47	3·08	3·19	2·94	3·63
Lines per cent. comprised in released movements	5·49	2·7	2·89	12·58	12·46	13·07	13·56
Alternations per cent. of lines	2·39	1·96	5·68	3·21	1·59	2·36	1·93
Lines per cent. comprised in alternations	16·18	13·24	36·49	21·81	9·57	12·13	12·83

HOMODYNE IN FOURTH FOOT OF VERGILIAN HEXAMETER 193

passages otherwise highly wrought, and when they seem to be built with released movements into elaborate rhythmical constructions. It is possible that alternations are fittest for passages of narrative, and appear most often in them; as *Aen.* III. 2'95/17'58 per cent., V. 2'77/17'32 per cent.: and that high figures or low figures for both released movements and alternations are not usually, with the important exception of *Aen.* VIII. 2'61/10'99, 1'92/11'83 per cent., associated together in the same poem or book.

From the primary classification by released movements and by alternations, in so far as they are technically relevant, other patterns are deducible. I do not by any means imply that all the lines of Vergil are adjusted to form elements of a complex relation of fourth-foot homodyne, or even that Vergil was continuously aware of these altering occurrences. But there is evidence enough that phenomena of fourth-foot homodyne are not seldom significant, and it is supported by the aesthetic quality of many great passages.¹

¹ These passages of Vergil seem especially capable of this rhythmical analysis: *Georg.* I. 415-423: II. 1-17: 161-176: 458-489: 532-542: IV. 1-12: 51-66: *Aen.* I. 1-38: 132-141: 223-237:

OF FOURTH FOOT HOMODYNE.

VL.

Georgics—							Aeneid—												
IX.	X.	Total.	II.	III.	IV.	Total.	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.	X.	XI.	XII.	Total.
37'31 7 12'86	31'17 10 60	37'16 83 57'23	33'21 28 82'14	32'51 15 66'3	33'75 25 64	33'45 81 71'6	28'61 36 61'1	39'37 62 77'51	36'29 60 75	36'14 56 75'36	39'19 46 60'87	34'04 64 71'87	38'84 51 70'59	39'97 40 87'5	33'25 84 67'86	32'59 90 62'2	37'9 69 60'87	36'28 62 75'97	35'95 720 70'69
0 0 0	0 6'49 23'38	0 2'53 9'95	6 3'32 14'21	0 4'24 18'02	2 4'06 17'67	10 3'53 14'65	6 3'72 15'67	12 2'39 10'06	4 3'23 14'49	5 4'21 16'14	2 4'05 17'09	5 5'12 21'36	4 4'07 17'51	4 2'61 10'99	8 3'45 14'29	10 3'77 16'85	8 3'83 16'98	6 3'51 15'77	74 3'7 15'75
2'95 19'4	1'29 6'49	2'72 14'51	2'58 14'06	3'18 18'2	2'47 13'6	2'7 15'6	1'58 10'87	2'64 14'47	2'95 17'58	1'71 10'43	2'77 17'32	2'78 16'13	2'22 12'21	1'92 11'83	2'46 12'26	2'11 12'86	2'96 17'63	1'99 13'04	2'34 14'32

OTHER POETIC POEMS.

Valerius Flaccus <i>Argon.</i> I	<i>Culex.</i>	<i>Ciris.</i>	<i>Moretum.</i>	<i>Dirae.</i>	<i>Lydia.</i>	<i>Est et non.</i>	<i>Vir bonus.</i>	<i>Aetna.</i>
26'5	35'59	42'14	32'26	46'6	25	56	42'31	34'36
34 61'76	14 64'29	18 44'4	11 45'45	5 40	7 42'86	2 100	4 100	35 60
5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
2'94	3'63	1'85	4'84	2'91	0	0	0	2'41
13'07	13'56	7'39	16'96	12'62	0	0	0	975
2'36	1'93	2'03	0'81	0'97	0	4	0	2'79
12'13	12'83	13'12	4'03	4'85	0	5	0	16'87

N

VI.

The conclusions of this paper, which are provisional, are these: Verse-texture is unusually important in Vergil, both in control of the emotional effect of his lines by the reluctance and sometimes the deceleration of *heterodyne* and by the freedom and sometimes the acceleration of *homodyne*. But in the second half of the hexameter changes of texture, for which the fourth foot is normally cardinal, may be significant not only expressionally, but structurally also, being made part of a pattern. This patterning can be conveniently classified by two formal principles, from which secondary formations can be deduced: the principles of the released movement and of the alternation,¹ the former characteristic of Vergil, the latter used by Vergil with peculiar effect, but both discernible in the work of other poets also. Patterns of fourth-foot homodyne seem therefore to be part of the workmanship sometimes, especially in highly wrought passages. It is possible that Vergil was conscious of them and consciously designed them; and that other poets, especially the contemporaries and successors of Vergil, were not unaware of them, but did not usually seek them, avoid them, or employ them with care. Vergil probably first noticed these occurrences in the work of his predecessors, and recognized their utility for controlling and sustaining the momentum of long epic passages: and probably sometimes his practice was partly followed by others. But since the patterns are present and are significantly part of the poetic quality of Vergil, it is undesirable to relate them closely to intention and design, and preferable to accept them, perhaps as the spontaneous expression of a faculty deeper than conscious choice.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

BLOXHAM SCHOOL.

II. 88-99: 199-233: III. 1-12: 712-718: IV. 1-19: 365-392: 630-658: 693-705: V. 1-16: VI. 1-27: 83-94: 417-460 (cf. 450-455 with 434-439): 587-594: 841-874: 888-901: VII. 195-208: 213-242: 591-615: 808-817: IX. 1-13: 146-161: X. 1-15: 132-138: 185-193: XI. 346-361: 903-915: XII. 134-141: 812-840: 940-952.

In some of them (cf. my forthcoming article in the *Classical Journal*) there seems to be a most elaborate scheme of balances and symmetries, sometimes based on released movements culminating in alternations, or fused together by them. It is unlikely that chance will account for all these formations, especially as they seem typical of Vergil alone. In other poets instances as clear as Ovid *Met.* 492-507 seem to be very rare.

¹ Vergil seems to me to have achieved an almost incredible beauty of art by adopting from others and blending in his own work rhythmical principles of alternation and release, which in the work of others appeared in comparative

triviality and insignificance: as indeed he adopted and blended sounds, images, and phrases of his predecessors and contemporaries. But these adoptions were united immediately as formal antitypes to principles of his own vision and method, principles which Professor R. S. Conway has shown to be of ultimate importance and value in Vergil's poetry. 'One of the principles of composition which I believe had a large share in shaping Vergil's work, though it is almost too simple to be called a principle, is the method of alternation, or contrast between successive parts of a poem' (R. S. Conway, *Vergil's Creative Art*, p. 5). Amant alterna camenae. 'The riddle of the story, the *deus*, is stated plainly in the celestial debate. . . . And at the end comes the solution, the *lógos*' (*ibid.*, p. 13). The first quotation matches also the alternation of fourth-foot homodyne; and the second seems to express the conflict and reconciliation of a released movement, precisely corresponding to the first lines of the *Aeneid*.

¹ A pa
Sussex b
² Haru
³ See
1926.
⁴ 'Peu
chumène
d'Arist.

xture is
ines by
om and
xameter
nificant
. This
which
ent and
gil with
terns of
ometimes,
nscious
lly the
did not
ly first
d their
es: and
nce the
gil, it is
accept
nscious

GHT.

deed he
phrases
es. But
ately as
n vision
or R. S.
ortance
he prin-
a large
almost
method
cessive
Creative
e riddle
in the
mes the
t quota-
rth-foot
ress the
l move-
st lines

THE HELLENISM OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.¹

IN seeking to understand the development of philosophy in later antiquity it is important to take account of Clement of Alexandria, perhaps the first Christian writer to be greatly influenced by the systems of Greece. Accordingly in this article certain aspects of Clement's doctrine will be selected for examination where his obligations to the philosophers have apparently hitherto received insufficient attention. In a valuable paper² Mr. R. P. Casey has dealt with many important points, but there is room for further exploration, both by the philological method and by a careful comparison of corresponding ideas in Clement and Plotinus. I am here concerned to stress resemblances rather than to prove, for instance, that any direct connection exists between Neoplatonism and Alexandrian theology. It is nevertheless not irrelevant to mention that Ammonius Saccas, the professor whose lectures both Origen the Christian and Plotinus were to attend, and who, besides being a Platonist, if not the founder of Neoplatonism,³ was also an apostate Christian, had probably begun to attract attention in Alexandria at the time when Clement was head of the Christian School there, in which perhaps Ammonius himself had been originally educated.⁴ There seems nothing to prevent the assumption that Ammonius and Clement were known at least by name to each other, and perhaps the philosopher under whom Plotinus was to study for eleven years had even sat by the side of Clement at the feet of Pantaenus, the erstwhile Stoic and founder of the Catechetical School. However that may be, both Neoplatonism and Alexandrian theology show a markedly similar tendency, and in the *Enneads* and the *Stromateis* there are many equivalent features. It must be owned that the success in achieving a unified and organic system out of all the heterogeneous elements which are introduced is not in the two works equally great. But Clement and Plotinus, especially in their syncretism of Platonism and Stoicism, often display the same philosophic temperament, and indeed as religious thinkers can be perhaps best appreciated when they are studied together.

In the *Protreptikos*, his earliest work, Clement shows a polemical attitude towards the Greek philosophers, always excepting Plato,⁵ and this leads him to be uncritical and without a just discrimination to condemn Parmenides and Heraclitus with their predecessors on the charge of hylotheism and therefore atheism.⁶ Aristotle and Theophrastus are dealt with in the same way, but the fact that stoicizing views are attributed to them implies that Clement is dependent for his information on later authorities, themselves probably inspired by Posidonius.⁷ Only when Clement turns to Plato does his enthusiasm for philosophy appear. In the effort to find a God transcending His creation Plato, we learn, must be taken as *συνεργὸς τῆς ἑκκλήσιως*.⁸ Amongst other Platonic citations Clement appeals to the famous statement⁹ in what he elsewhere¹⁰ terms the Great Epistle, that the Good is incapable of expression, either in speech or in writing, but is apprehended by a sudden flash of intuition. In the same connection may be mentioned a remarkable phrase in the *Stromateis*¹¹ about

¹ A paper read at the general meeting of the Sussex branch of the *Cl. Ass.*, 1931.

² *Harv. Th. Rev.* 18 (1925).

³ See an article by F. Heinemann, *Hermes*, 1926.

⁴ 'Peut-être même élevé dans l'école des Catéchumènes,' Ravaisson, *Essai sur la métaph.* d'Arist. (1846) II, 372; see also Bidez, *Vie de*

Porph. 12, 69.

⁵ 'Clemens in Plato lebt und webt.' Bousset, *Jüd.-chr. Schulbetr.* 227.

⁶ *Pr.* 64. Contrast Plot. V, i, 8. 9.

⁷ *Pr.* 66, 4-5. Stählin for Arist. compares *De mund.* 397b, and for Theoph. Cic. *N.D.* I, 35.

⁸ 68, 1. ⁹ *Ep.* VII, 341c. ¹⁰ *St.* V, 77, 1.

¹¹ *Ibid.* VI, 61, 3.

'the knowledge handed down in succession from the apostles unwritten (*ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀγράφως παραδοθεῖσα*) unto a small number.' Later in the *Protreptikos* a Neopythagorean theory is introduced with evident approbation,¹ and since its character has been held by Schmekel² to be Posidonian it deserves to be examined in its entirety. 'God is one, and He is not, as some suppose, outside this world-system but immanent therein, the whole of Him in the whole of its sphere, surveying all creation,³ the complete blend of the ages, the author of all His own powers and works, the giver of light in heaven, Mind, the source of life for the whole sphere and of motion for all things.' The phrase *ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ* is of considerable importance and may be brought into relation with Clement's doctrine of the presence in the world of the Logos⁴ and with what Ammonius Saccas teaches on the relation between the soul and the body.⁵ The idea recurs several times in Plotinus⁶ and serves as a philosophic formula for his mysticism. Whether or not Posidonius is the ultimate source from which the phrase is derived in the passage quoted, of the importance of the conception in later philosophy there can be no doubt. It is of interest that there is no censure of the expression, which has a Stoic ring, *κράσις τῶν ὅλων αἰώνων*.⁷ Clement evidently does not understand by it a hylotheism of the kind that he has already criticized, but the exact sense in which he takes it is hard to determine.

At the end of the *Protreptikos* appears the adumbration of a Logos-doctrine. The divine Logos is the genuine son of Nous, light of light the pattern, and the real man, the human Nous, is an image of the Logos.⁸ Now the metaphor of light is used in a similar way in the *Enneads*, when the relation between Soul and Nous is described as *φῶς ἐκ φωτός*.⁹ It reappears in a well-known clause of the Nicene Creed, and perhaps enters Greek philosophy with the advent of Posidonius.¹⁰ Clement also mentions 'the heavenly and truly divine love (*ἐρώς*),¹¹ and displaying again the influence of the Seventh Platonic Epistle adds that this love 'comes to men when Beauty in its reality (*τὸ ὄντως καλόν*) having been kindled in the soul itself by the divine Logos is able to burst forth into flame.'¹²

The main criticism which is brought against the philosophers in the *Protreptikos*, that of hylotheism, is succinctly expressed by Clement in the remark made about the Stoics in the *Stromateis*¹³ that 'they say not well that God being body pervades the vilest matter.' Clement there seeks to preserve God's perfect goodness from contamination with the material world. Yet we have seen that he admits a dictum (Posidonian or not) that in the most emphatic way affirms divine immanence. There is, in fact, a clash between two cosmological views, for pantheism with its implicit optimism is opposed by the doctrine (attractive to later Stoics like Seneca¹⁴) that the world is too wicked to admit identification with God. In later antiquity to many devout minds Plato seemed to express pessimism about the sensible world. Had not the Master, moreover, affirmed in the *Republic* that the Good transcends even Reality? But the Neoplatonists took their stand on the cosmology of the *Timaeus*, which they made the basis of an elaborate theodicy and optimism. The following words about Plato, from the Plotinian *Essay on the Descent of the Soul*, are significant: 'What, then, does this philosopher say? He does not seem to express the same view

¹ 72, 4-5.

² *Mittl. St.* 430, 436. Cf. perhaps Cic. *N.D.* I, 27.

³ Cf. *St.* VI, 156, 5, where Homer is used as by Epict. *Dis.* I, 14, 9.

⁴ Stähli. III, p. 220, 1. 10: *κατὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῳ*. *St.* VII, 16, 5: *ὅλα τε ἐκάστοις καὶ κοινῇ πᾶσιν, εἰς ὧν σωτήρ*.

⁵ Nemes. *N. Hom.* 58: *ὅλη δι' ὅλου χωρεῖ καὶ τοῦ φωτός ἐαυτῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος*.

⁶ E.g. V, i, 2 (Müll. II, 143¹⁴). VI, iv, v, *passim*.

⁷ Cf. the Valentinian view, *Exc. ex. Theod.* 17, 1.

⁸ *Pr.* 98, 4.

⁹ IV, iii, 17. VI, iv, 9. Also Hermes Cyr. *c. Jul.* I, 556, B.

¹⁰ If my contention in *C.Q.* XXIV, 206, is sound. Cf. *ἀπαύγασμα φωτός*, *Soph. Sal.* 7, 25.

¹¹ The Platonic term, instead of *N.T.* ἀγάπη (which, however, is used in *St.* VI, 71, 4. 104, 1), illustrates Clement's belief in an *amor intellectualis Dei*.

¹² *Pr.* 117, 2.

¹³ I, 51, 1.

¹⁴ E.g. *Ben.* I, 10, V, 17 (after discounting rhetoric).

alwa
thing
to be
of th
that
migh
to pa
duali
mann
and
Neop
Worl
of th
passa
the h
ventu
thing
know
comp
Clem
Perha
been
in Ch
Stoics
the sa
human
of inc
when
Empe
Clearl
hyper
T
equall
(νόμος
gestin
be app
transc
adequa
1 IV,
2 Like
the bod
pneuma
52, 2. 13
For Cle
IV, 9. 4
less tha
sano (*St.*
5 *St.* I
6 Cha
Atticus,
Devil (*S*
6 Cf.
7 See
p. 274.
8 *SVF*
10 IV,

always, so that one may easily see his meaning, but having despised every sensible thing and found fault with the soul's association with the body, he declares the soul to be in bondage and entombed in the body . . . [but] in the *Timaeus*, when he talks of this sensible universe, he praises the world and declares it to be a blest deity, and that its soul has been given by a Demiurge who is good, so that this sensible world might be endowed with Nous. For this was destined to be, and could not have come to pass without soul.¹¹ In general Plotinus is careful to guard himself against a dualistic metaphysic, though both he and Clement often spurn the body in the manner of Pythagorean asceticism.¹² But Clement is readier to sacrifice monism, and following Philo, whom he can call a Pythagorean,¹³ and the platonizing Neopythagorean Numenius, who had discovered in Plato an evil as well as a good World-Soul,¹⁴ and whose First God exists in self-contemplation apart from the evil of the material world,¹⁵ he emphasizes divine transcendence, which in at least one passage he makes absolute. 'God has no natural relation to us, as the authors of the heresies desire . . . for matter is completely different from God—unless one venture to declare that we are a part of Him and of the same substance (*ὁμοούσιος*), a thing which no one who regards the evils in which our lives are involved, if he have knowledge of God, can possibly endure to hear.'¹⁶ This extreme view is hardly compatible with other doctrines which will be considered later, and is occasioned by Clement's desire of contrasting his own position with that occupied by his rivals. Perhaps the most interesting point is the rejection of the term *ὁμοούσιος*, which had been employed in Gnosticism,¹⁷ and which was later to become the great battle-ground in Christian theology. Against the Gnostics here and (like Plutarch¹⁸) against the Stoics elsewhere,¹⁹ Clement will not allow that the human and the divine natures are the same in kind. Plotinus, however, is able to apply the term *ὁμοούσιος* to the human soul in relation to the divine,²⁰ and Clement himself may easily be convicted of inconsistency. For the soul, we read, *μελετᾷ εἶναι θεός*, and the Gnostic becomes when perfected *ἐν σαρκὶ περιπολῶν θεός*.²¹ As in *Ennead* IV, vii, 15, the well-known Empedoclean doctrine of the potential divinity of man is accepted by Clement.²² Clearly, then, the statement that God has no natural relation to man is Clement's hyperbole, and must be understood as belonging to the method of negation.

The *via negativa* which had been chosen by the Middle Platonists²³ is followed equally by Clement.²⁴ One passage where Clement discusses how the apprehension (*νόησις*) of God may be achieved is introduced with the words *ἀφελόντες πάντα*,²⁵ suggesting Maximus of Tyre and Plotinus.²⁶ It is further stated that the Almighty can be apprehended by knowing not what He is,²⁷ but what He is not.²⁸ Clement's God, transcending space, time and scientific apprehension,²⁹ and admitting as the most adequate positive term predicable of Him the name of unity, has a close resemblance

¹¹ IV, viii, 1.

¹² Like Plotinus (III, vi, 58), overfeeding of the body is held by Clement to corrupt the *πνεῦμα* around the soul (*Paid.* II, 17, 3. Cf. *St.* VI, 52, 2. 136, 1. II, 115, 3 sqq. Cf. *Herm.* X, 13, 16). For Clement's ascetic view see *St.* VII, 79, 6. IV, 9, 4. But against the Gnostics Clement, no less than Plotinus, stresses *mens sana in corpore sano* (*St.* IV, 17, 4 sqq. IV, 22, 1).

¹³ *St.* I, 72, 4.

¹⁴ Chalc. in *Tim.* 295. Like Plutarch and Atticus, Clement deduces a Platonic belief in a Devil (*St.* V, 92, 5).

¹⁵ Cf. *Eus. Pr. Ev.* 537c.

¹⁶ *St.* II, 74. Else God were *μερικῶς ἀμαρτάνων*.

¹⁷ See Hatch, *Infl. of Greek Ideas on Church*, p. 274, n. 2. Cf. *Exc. ex Theod.* 50, 2.

¹⁸ *SVF* III, 246.

¹⁹ *St.* VII, 88, 5.

²⁰ IV, vii, 15. Cf. IV, iv, 28 (Müll. II, 67³⁴).

²¹ *St.* VI, 113, 3. VII, 101, 4.

²² *Ibid.* IV, 149, 8. See also Theiler, *Problemata*, I, 109.

²³ E.g. Albinus, *Didasc.* 165, l. 5, Herm. Apuleius, *Apol.* 64 *ad fin.*

²⁴ For Plot. in relation to Clem cf. Casey, p. 75 sqq., in relation to Albinus Theiler, *op. cit.* 57.

²⁵ *St.* V, 71, 3.

²⁶ See Theiler, *op. cit.* 57. *Enn.* III, viii, 10w. V, iii, 17k. V, v, 13. VI, vii, 38. VI, viii, 21.

²⁷ 'Nemo novit Deum,' *Sen. Ep.* 31, 10.

²⁸ *St.* V, 71, 3.

²⁹ Casey is right (I think) in doubting the truth of Dr. Inge's assertion that Clement feels an objection to placing God beyond Reality. (This in spite of *St.* IV, 162, 5.) Pantaeus had already taken this step (Stählin, III, p. 224, l. 20).

to the One of Plotinus. Clement, in agreement with Plutarch, Numenius and Plotinus,¹ approves the name of Apollo which the Pythagoreans had given to the Absolute, owing to its presumed derivation from *ἀ* and *πολλά*.² He sees clearly that some positive conceptions of God are necessary as a basis for discursive reason, *ἐν' ἑχθρῇ ἢ διάνοια ἐπερείδεται τοῖς τοῖς*,³ and so anticipates the Plotinian view that any statement about the One is impossible *ὥς ἂν μὴ ἔχωμεν ἐπὶ τὶ ἐρείδοντες τὴν διάνοιαν λεγόμεν*.⁴ These postulates of the discursive reason may be verified by that higher faculty of the mind which affords immediate apprehension, Gnosis, of intelligible reality and of its ground. To actualize this faculty is *περινοεῖν*,⁵ a word which seems to have been used technically in the mysteries,⁶ and which occurs, usually in the same sense, in the *Axiochus*,⁷ Philo,⁸ Marcus Aurelius⁹ and Plotinus.¹⁰

Before passing on to the Clementine Logos-doctrine it is well to notice an important use of the Second Platonic Epistle, which Clement quotes in the Fifth *Stromateus* (103, 1)¹¹ in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. After mentioning *Timaeus* 41a he continues: 'So that when he says [viz. Plato in *Ep. II*, 312e] "Around the king of all things all things are, and because of Him they are and this is the cause of all good things, and around the second order is the Second and around the third order is the Third," I understand nothing else to be meant but the Holy Trinity.'¹² Now the same appeal is made in the *Enneads* in support of the doctrine of the three Hypostases.¹³ The passage had been already used by Justin Martyr and by Celsus,¹⁴ the Valentinian Gnostics had turned it to account,¹⁵ and it had apparently become a favourite text for quotation by the end of the second century. The suggestion has been made¹⁶ that it attracted the attention of Christian writers owing to the use made of it by the Platonists. But there appears no possibility of determining whether or not the Christian and non-Christian Platonists had adopted it independently. The Clementine Trinity, like its triadic equivalent in the *Enneads*, may be expanded into a hierarchy consisting of a manifold chain of existences. 'Characteristic of the highest power is the accurate scrutiny of all the parts, extending even to the minutest. . . . From a single first principle above, whose activity proceeds as it wills, the first and second and third depend [*ἡρτῆται*, like the frequent *ἐξήρτῆται*, *ἀνῆρτῆται* of Plotinus]. Then at the highest extremity of the visible world is the blest band of angels, and in fact down to ourselves they are successively arranged one under another, both saved and saving from one and by One.'¹⁷ It is easy to find parallel passages in the *Enneads*.¹⁸ An intermediate position in the scale is given by Plotinus to the demons and by Clement to the angels. Clement also uses the word demon, and, like Plotinus, considers that to this rank the *σπουδαῖος* has already ascended.¹⁹ A similar *Stufenfolge der Geister* had already appeared in Philo²⁰ and may have been developed by Posidonius.²¹

¹ Plut. 393c, 354. Numen. Macrob. *Sat.* I, 17, 65. Plot. V, v, 6. *Cratyl.* 405c (cited by Bury, *C.R.* XXXIII, 45) is different.

² *St. I*, 164, 3. ³ *St. V*, 82, 1.

⁴ III, viii, 9. Cf. VI, ix, 3: *γνώσις εἰδέναι ἐπερείδεται*, and VI, ix, 6. ⁵ *St. V*, 71, 1.

⁶ See Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Myst.* 235, 306.

⁷ 370c. *λογὸς περινοητικός* is Hermetic.

⁸ *Qu. D. Imm.* 78. What follows in § 79 may be influenced by Posidonius.

⁹ IX, 32. XI, 1.

¹⁰ VI, ix, 11. Cf. IV, viii, 7E. ¹¹ Cf. *Pr.* 68, 5.

¹² The term first appears in Theophilus, II, 15.

¹³ I, viii, 2. V, i, 8. VI, vii, 42.

¹⁴ *Apol.* I, 60. *Cont. Cels.* VI, 18.

¹⁵ Hippolyt. *Elench.* VI, 37.

¹⁶ Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Ap.* 212 (on Athenagoras, *Presb.* 23). *Apol.* 64.

¹⁷ *St. VII*, 9, 2. Cf. *Enn.* V, iii, 15: *τὸ μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ σώτῃ*. Procl. *Inst. Theol.* 13 (*Select Passages* XXI, Dodds).

¹⁸ II, ix, 8, 9. III, ii, 3. V, i, 4. See also *Herm.* XV, 17.

¹⁹ *St. VII*, 78, 6. *Enn.* III, iv, 3. Clement (after Philo, *De fort.* 9) regards the *σπουδαῖος* as *μεθόριος* between a mortal and an immortal nature (*St. II*, 81, 2). For Plutarch the demons are *ὥσπερ ἐν μεθόριῳ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων* (416c), and for Plotinus the soul is *μεθόριος, ὁμοιος*, between the Sensible and the Intelligible World (*Enn.* IV, iv, 3, E. IV, viii, 7), with which cf. Nemesius, *N. Hom.* 14. Hipp. *El.* VI, 23, 2, etc., 'medioximi'; *Apul. Plat.* I, 95, 7.

²⁰ *Gig.* 6, 7.

²¹ On the relation to Posidonius, see Bousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-20.

Clement's Logos-doctrine is best studied in the *Paidagogos* and the *Stromateis*, for these works are addressed to Christians rather than to the Greeks,¹ and therefore contain his esoteric teaching. Clement has now dropped polemics, and pleading the cause of philosophy, which the *Protreptikos* had attacked along with the other errors of paganism, adduces the *testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae*, which many of the philosophers have evinced. Clement, like Philo, finds that all the more important ideas of Greek thought have been borrowed from the 'barbarian philosophy' of the Old Testament. Aristotle is declared to have assented to Scripture,² and the Numenian view is quoted that Plato is only Moses talking Attic.³ Extensive plagiarism may be detected even among the philosophers themselves. The Stoics have borrowed from Plato and Plato from Pythagoras. In short, Clement is determined to minimize the originality of the philosophers, and this same attitude, it may be added, is shown conversely by the critics of Christianity. Thus a member of the Plotinian school, Amelius of Apamea, in an interesting reference to the Fourth Gospel, for which Clement himself had a special admiration,⁴ maintained that the Logos-doctrine of the Prologue was derived by 'the barbarian' from Heraclitus.⁵

The opening of the *Paidagogos*, where there is a discussion of the various offices which the Logos performs, has been well connected by Stählin with the Posidonian view preserved by Seneca in *Ep.* 95, 65, according to which in rhetoric not only *praeceptio* (for which Clement has λόγος διδασκαλικός) is required, but also *suasio* (ὑποθετικός), *consolatio* (παραμυθητικός), and *exhortatio* (προτρεπτικός). Now, after applying these epithets, Clement adds that the self-same Logos 'trains up men into the single salvation of faith in God (εἰς τὴν μονότροπον τῆς εἰς τὸν θεὸν πίστεως σωτηρίαν παιδαγωγῶν).'⁶ The use of the verb παιδαγωγεῖν, which perhaps is ultimately inspired by Plato,⁷ and which plays a considerable part in co-ordinating the different elements in Clement's Logos-doctrine, may be connected most closely with the New Testament saying, that πίστις is the result of training by the νόμος παιδαγωγός.⁸ Seneca has the phrase 'Deus paedagogus' in a letter which seems coloured by Posidonian beliefs.⁹ Maximus of Tyre mentions the need of the soul for a teacher to direct the eagerness of her desires (διδασκάλου διαπαιδαγωγούντος τὰς φιλοτιμίας),¹⁰ and this teacher he says is the Logos. In the *Enneads* the question is asked τίς λόγος τοῦτον τὸν ἔρωτα παιδαγωγῆται;¹¹ and mention is made of a λόγος παιδαγωγῶν καὶ πίστιν παρεχόμενος.¹² The combination here of *logos paidagogos* and *pistis* is at the least a striking coincidence, but it cannot safely be urged that Plotinus here is directly dependent on Clement.

The ontological use of the term Logos in Clement is the most important aspect of his Hellenism. Theophilus, slightly earlier, had accepted the Stoic distinction of the *logos prophorikos* and *endiathetos*,¹³ but Clement will not allow the former term to be applied to the Son.¹⁴ Another of the early Christian theologians, Athenagoras, had identified God with either Pneuma or Logos,¹⁵ but this is not Clement's view. The salient points in his doctrine are brought out in the following passage: 'The best thing on earth is the most pious man, and the best thing in heaven is an angel. . . . But the nature of the Son, being nearest to Him who is alone almighty, is the most perfect and powerful and princely and kingly. This is the highest excellence . . .

¹ According to Casey, they are 'the first pieces of early Christian literature that assume the existence of an educated Christian public.'

² *St. I*, 87, 3. The whole passage that precedes this deserves attention.

³ *Ibid.* I, 150, 4. Clement's harmonization of Judaism and Hellenism is helped by his free indulgence in the allegorical method, so dear to the Alexandrians. The symbolism of the O.T., he holds (*St. V*, iv, vii), resembles the Egyptian use of hieroglyphic (cf. *Plot. V*, viii, 6).

⁴ *Eus. H.E.* VI, 14, 7.

⁵ *Eus. Pr. Ev.* 540b.

⁷ *Symp.* 210e.

⁹ *Ep.* 110, 1.

¹⁰ 7, 8, *Düb.* See also Theiler, *op. cit.* 135, n. 1, where references to the *Hermetica* are given.

¹¹ *V*, ix, 2.

¹² *VI*, ix, 4. Cf. also *VI*, vii, 36.

¹³ *II*, 22.

¹⁴ *St. V*, 6, 3.

¹⁵ *Presb.* 20. See Hatch, *op. cit.* 265.

⁶ *I*, 1, 1.

⁸ *Gal.* 3, 24-5.

which orders all things according to the will of the Father, and holds the helm of the Universe¹ in the best way, performing all things with unwearied and tireless power,² beholding those secret Ideas by which it operates. For the Son of God never leaves his own place of view,³ not being divided nor severed (*οὐ μεριζόμενος, οὐκ ἀποτεμνόμενος*), not passing from place to place, but being at all times in all places and in no respect circumscribed, completely Nous, completely light of the Father. To this the paternal Logos, all the host of angels and of gods is subordinate.⁴ Two doctrines of cardinal importance are here expressed, the inseparability yet distinct natures of God and the Logos, the eternal and ubiquitous⁵ presence of the Logos in the world. The latter idea we have already seen to be shared by Clement and Plotinus. The idea of inseparability is prominent in the *Enneads*, especially in the phrase constantly used to describe the relation between the lower and the higher hypostasis *οὐκ ἀποτέμνεται*,⁶ and in Christian theology becomes a principal dogma.⁷

Allied to these doctrines is another, which both in Neoplatonism and Alexandrian theology receives emphasis, that of undiminished giving. With this is often in the *Enneads* combined the theory, derived in all probability from the physics of Posidonius,⁸ that sunlight is projected without any diminution of its source. Clement holds that like the Sun sending his beams everywhere, even into the inmost parts of houses,⁹ so the Logos is diffused in every direction;¹⁰ but its activity remains unimpaired: *οὐ γὰρ ἡ τῆς σοφίας μετάδοσις κινούντων καὶ ἰσχύοντων ἀλλήλους τῆς τε ἐνεργείας καὶ τοῦ μετέχοντος γίνεται, οὐδ' ἀφαιρουμένου τινος οὐδ' ἐνδεοῦς γινομένου· ἀμείωτος δ' οὖν ἡ ἐνέργεια δι' αὐτῆς τῆς μεταδόσεως δέκνεται*.¹¹ Now I have already dealt with this doctrine in a previous article,⁸ but it is well here to cite further instances of its occurrence, including passages from early patristic literature. Ammonius Saccas, if correctly reported by Nemesius,¹² was familiar with all the main features: 'Just as the sun by its presence transforms the air to light'¹³ . . . in the same way also the soul being united with the body remains completely free from interfusion (*ἀσύγχυτος*). The divine Logos,¹⁴ we learn later,¹⁵ remains in its source and does not suffer diminution (*μένων ἐν ᾧ περ ἦν καὶ πρὸ τῆς μίξεως . . . μὴ μειούμενος*). Origen, Clement's successor in the Catechetical School, has the sentence: *αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μεταδίδωσι . . . οὐ κατ' ἀποτομὴν καὶ διαίρεσιν*,¹⁶ and acknowledges that light is given without diminution, and that this takes place in such a way 'ut origo ipsa luminis nihil damni ex commercio derivationis acceperit'.¹⁷ The conception is found in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Tertullian and Alexander Lycopolitanus.¹⁸

¹ Numenian (Eus. *Pr. Ev.* 539d).

² Posidonian? Cf. *De Mund.* 397b 23. Plot. Müll. I, 249³. II, 207¹⁷. 346¹⁸.

³ The same word (see Plato, *Pol.* 272e) is used by Numenius (Eus. *Pr. Ev.* 537d) and Maximus 17, 6. Cf. also *Protr.* 68, 3.

⁴ *St.* VII, 5, 2 sqq.

⁵ The Holy Spirit is *ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ* (*Psalm.* I, 42, 1) and *ἀμέωτος μεριζόμενος* (*St.* VI, 138, 2). Cf. *Enn.* IV, i, 1. IV, ii, 2.

⁶ This phrase or a variation of it occurs e.g. I, i, 2. I, vii, 12. II, iii, 7. II, ix, 32. III, v, 4. IV, iii, 9, 12b. IV, iv, 292. IV, ix, 5. V, i, 6. VI, ii, 22. VI, iv, 3, 10, 14. VI, v, 12. VI, ix, 9. Cf. also Epict. *Dis.* I, 5, 9. *Hermes.* XII, 9. Philo, *Gig.* 25.

⁷ Athanas. *Exp. Fid.* 2, on the impossibility of imagining *τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις μεμερισμένας*.

⁸ *C.Q.* XXIV, 206-7. Cicero (*Off.* I, 51) has the following: 'Omnia autem communia hominum videntur ea, quae sunt generis eius, quod, ab Ennio positum in una re, transferri in multas

potest: Homo, qui erranti comiter monstrat uiam, / quasi lumen de suo lumine accendat, facit, / nihilominus ipsi lucet, cum illi accenderit.' Admittedly this fragment has a striking resemblance to the passages which I have argued must go back to a common source. But Ennius does not enunciate the complete doctrine of sunlight, which in my view was first developed by Posidonius.

⁹ Cf. *Enn.* IV, iii, 4.

¹⁰ *St.* VII, 21, 7. ¹¹ *St.* VII, 47, 6.

¹² N.H. *Matth.*, p. 133-4 (58), 138 (60).

¹³ Cf. the probably Posidonian doctrine, Cleom. *Propr. Mot. Cael.* II, 4, 102, and for light in air *Enn.* I, i, 4 (*μήτι πάσχειν τὰ ἐκείνου πάθη, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ φῶς*). IV, iv, 14, 18, 29. iii, 10, 22. Max. Tyr. 34, 2 (where the theory serves to illustrate that soul is *ἀναεκραμένη* with body). Eus. *D.E.* 168a, 314c. ¹⁴ Reading *θεῖος*. ¹⁵ See note 12.

¹⁶ *Cont. Cel.* VI, 70. ¹⁷ Num. *Hom.* VI, 70.

¹⁸ Just. *Ap.* 61c, 128. Tat. *Or.* 5. Ath. *Presb.* 18. Tert. *Ap.* 31. *Prax.* 8, 132. 22. Alex. *Cont. Manich.* 17.

There are other aspects of Clement's Logos-doctrine which link up with the theory of sunlight. Thus, although in one place Clement, after Philo,¹ regards the Logos as being sent down as in a shower,² it is more usually referred to as an ἀπόρροια, a divine effluence. The term is found in the Wisdom of Solomon³ and thereafter frequently occurs in writings where Posidonian ideas have been held to appear.⁴ This ἀπόρροια is the Logos conceived as pervading men's minds. From another point of view the Son, the νοερός λόγος,⁵ may be said to energize as He regards the Father's goodness,⁶ a statement which should be associated with what Clement teaches elsewhere, that the Platonic Ideas are contained in God.⁷ Creation must be eternal and, in agreement with Plotinus and Philo whom Clement cites, just as sunlight could never have been incapable of shining, so creation could not have had a beginning in time.⁸ Though both Clement and (with rather more limitation) Plotinus allow the idea of an ἀπόρροια,⁹ they both reject the Gnostic view (not unknown among the earliest Christian writers) that the soul is a βολή or προβολή.¹⁰ Clement's use of the term ἀπόρροια, which is supported in one place by an appeal to the Platonists,¹¹ is very bold: 'Into all men whatever, especially those who are engaged in intellectual pursuits (τοῖς περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἐνδιατρίβουσι) there has been instilled a divine ἀπόρροια.'¹² Indeed one passage where the term occurs is attacked by Photius for its heterodoxy. Whether or no the charge that Photius makes of Docetism can be fairly maintained against Clement,¹³ the prevailing view which the latter holds of the Logos is rather that of a cosmological principle than of an Historic Person, and approximates very closely to the thought of Plotinus on the same subject.¹⁴

The Logos-Son in Clement, like the Plotinian Nous,¹⁵ is said to have unity as πάντα ἐν,¹⁶ and the way in which this conception is developed by introducing the notion of a circle and its centre recalls the use of the same figure several times in the *Enneads*.¹⁷ Plotinus combines with this simile the view that the Absolute is both the external span of the Universe and that in the infinite abyss of which the Universe is embraced.¹⁸ With this thought and with Seneca's conception of God as 'quod uidet totum et quod non uidet totum . . . solus opus suum et extra et intra tenet'¹⁹ may be associated the following, where Clement is building on a Philonic basis: 'Some

¹ *All. Leg.* III, 162. Cf. *Hermes*. XVIII, 11.

² *Paid.* I, 41, 3. *St. I.* 37, 2.

³ *W.* 25: ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εὐλακρινῆς. Cf. ἀκροβολισμοί, Numen.

⁴ *Max. Tyr.* 4, 7. (ἀπορροή). *Plut.* 375b but 930e. *Athenag. Presb.* 10, 24. *Marc. Aur.* II, 4. Cf. also *Marc. Aur.* XII, 2. *Sen. Ep.* 120, 14: 'mens Dei, ex qua pars et in hoc pectus mortale defluxit.' Cf. further Philo, *Act. Mund.* 88, and *Enn.* II, 1, 7.

⁵ The Plotinian νοητός λόγος (cf. *C.Q.* XXV, 105) is the Life in Nous (ζωή ἡν ἐν αὐτῷ, VI, vii, 8, with which cf. *Fourth Gospel* I, 4).

⁶ *St. V.* 38, 7.

⁷ *St. V.* 16, 3. VI, 156, 5-6. *ἐπίνοια* is of interest: *Posid.* (Diog. Laert. VII, 135, and *Dox. Gr.* 458) distinguishes κατ' ἐπίνοιαν καὶ κατ' ὑπόστασιν (found in *Alex. Aph.*, *Sext. Emp.*, *Orig.*, *SVF* II, 488). *Dox. Gr.* 448, seems verbally Posidonian (not Aristotelian: see *Socr. H.E.* III, vii). Notice Plotinus' question (VI, vi, 9): ἀρ' οὖν τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἐπιβολῇ; ἢ καὶ τῇ ὑποστάσει.

⁸ *St. VI.* 141, 7-142, 4. 159, 4 (Stähl. quotes Philo and Aristoboulos). For 'eternal generation' in Plotinus VI, viii, 20: γεννήσας διδίδω. *Enn.* II, ix, 3. III, ii, 9. V, i, 6. VI, vii, 3.

⁹ Cf. III, 4, 32: οὐκ ἀπόρροια.

II, iii, 11. III, v, 3. V, iii, 12: οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνέργεια. III, 2, 2: τὸ γὰρ ἀπορροῦν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου. Also VI, vii, 22: ψυχὴν λαβοῦσαν εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν ἐκείθεν ἀπορροήν. But II, i, 8: τίς ἂν τρόπος ἀπορροῆς γένοιτο. See also Dieter. *Abrax.* 196, 4.

¹⁰ Cf. Hatch, *op. cit.* 264, 266, n. 1. *Clem. St. III.* i, 1. V, 126, 2. *Plot. Enn.* VI, iv, 3.

¹¹ *St. V.* 88, 2.

¹² *Pr.* 68, 2. Cf. Stähl. III, 210, 1. 10: 'virtutes eiusdem filii, sicut radius solis usque ad haec infima loca pertransiens,' and pp. *Exc. ex Theod.* 2, 2. ἀπόρροια was used by the Peratae (*Hipp. El.* V, 15, 2, etc.).

¹³ The passage preserved by Photius is given by Stähl. III, 202. See also Hastings, *Dict. Rel. Eth.* IV, 834. Pohlenz, *Zorn Gottes*, 60.

¹⁴ Roughly Clement's Logos = the Plotinian Nous.

¹⁵ *Enn.* V, iii, 15. VI, vii, 142, etc.

¹⁶ *St. IV.* 156, 2.

¹⁷ IV, ii, 1. III, viii, 7. IV, iii, 2, 17. VI, ix, 8. VI, v, 5. V, i, 7, 11. IV, iv, 16. VI, vii, 18. VI, viii, 18. See also *Alex. Aph. De An.* 63, 8, Bruns.

¹⁸ VI, viii, 18. Cf. VI, v, 129.

¹⁹ *Praef. Nat. Qu.* 13.

have used the term *βυθός*,¹ as God is held to contain and embosom all things (*περιελήφота καὶ ἐγκολπιζόμενον τὰ πάντα*).² Not only the relation between a circle and its centre but also that which exists between the sum of scientific truth and each of its constituent sciences serves to illustrate Clement's view of unity in diversity;³ and the same image, which had been used by Philo,⁴ is found more than once in the *Enneads*⁵ and elsewhere.⁶

As the Logos-Son is present to individual souls and as it is centred in God, every soul is potentially in contact with the latter. This indeed, like *Nous* in the Plotinian system, is the mediating principle whereby souls are brought into focus with their divine centre. This is the means of achieving *ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ*,⁷ and this is the higher principle (since the Son is more unified than the Spirit)⁸ to which all the spiritual faculties converge. There is not room here to examine the question of Clement's mysticism, but one of his ideas must be mentioned, since it appears in several mystical passages of the Middle Platonists and Plotinus. God's power, he says, is always in contact (*ἀπτομένη*)⁹ with us, and the same thought is expressed by the words *ἡ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐπαφωμένη τῆς ψυχῆς δύναμις ἅμα νοήματι πάντα γινώσκει*.¹⁰ Now in the *Enneads* *ἐφάπτεσθαι*, *ἐπαφή*, frequently occur,¹¹ retaining their importance in later Neoplatonism.¹² Perhaps once again the first to stress this idea was Posidonius,¹³ especially if he was the Stoic to whom it first occurred to identify the Aristotelian *koine aisthesis* with the faculty of apperception and to name this faculty *ἡ ἐντὸς ἀφή*.¹⁴ Other aspects of the theory of *ἐπαφή* in Clement are that God is apprehended by all things, even by that which is inanimate owing to its sympathy with that which is animate (*τὰ ἄνυχα συμπαθεύοντα τῷ ζῳῳ*),¹⁵ and the apparent acceptance, as by Plutarch and Plotinus,¹⁶ of a belief in telepathy.¹⁷ The metaphors of light and vision are exploited by Clement. God being always near to the individual soul¹⁸ beholds it bare (*γυμνὴν ἔσωθεν τὴν ψυχὴν βλέπων*),¹⁹ and looks upon all things and each thing in particular with one immediate glance (*ἀθρόως μὴ προσβολῇ*, perhaps appropriated from Platonism²⁰). The human soul is said—again conformably with Platonism—to possess its own interior light, but it may need to remove the film which is wont to overspread the eye of the soul.²¹ The advent of the light is characterized by its suddenness, and in this belief Clement again shows his Platonism.²²

The influence of Hellenism on the thought of Clement is, I think, discernible in his use in a philosophic sense of the term *epistrophe*, and, as I have not seen any full discussion of this point, I shall deal with it in conclusion.²³ In the sense of a change

¹ Used by Gnosticism to denote the Absolute (Hippol. *El.* VI, 37. Iren. *adv. Haer.* I, 1). See also Hatch, 251.

² *St.* V, 81, 3. Cf. II, 5, 4, and *ἐγκολπίζασθαι* in *Enn.* I, iv, 6.

³ *St.* I, 97, 4. Cf. VI, 155, 3, pp. VI, 160, 2.

⁴ *Gig.* 25.

⁵ IV, iii, 2. IV, ix, 5. VI, iv, 4E (cf. Porphy. *Sent.* 37). V, viii, 4 seems to point to Plato, *Phaedr.* 247D.

⁶ *Or. Princ.* I, 1, 3. Alex. Lyc. *Cont. Manich.* 164 Brinkm.

⁷ Plat. *Theaet.* 176B. *Hebrews*, 7, 3.

⁸ Cf. *νοῦς* and *ψυχή* in Plotinus.

⁹ *St.* II, 5, 5.

¹⁰ *St.* VII, 37, 2.

¹¹ E.g. (references to Müller's edit.) I, 9, 25. 18, 20, 48, 1. 137, 23. II, 132, 19. 177, 4. 199, 28, 411, 26, 440, 21. 446, 9. 450, 25 (cf. II, 113, 13 with *Strom.* VI, 85, 5. *Pr.* 68, 2. Plat. (*Symp.*, 212a, etc.).

¹² E.g. Sallustius, ch. 16, 17.

¹³ So Theiler, *op. cit.* 101-2, 135. Notice Plutarch 382, 588-9. Albinus, *Didask.* 169, 1, 22,

Herm.

¹⁴ See Schmekel, *op. cit.* 265, n. 1. v. Arnim includes the passage as *SVF* II, 852.

¹⁵ *St.* V, 133, 7. Here I take occasion to point out the striking similarity in the conception of stellar influence between *Ennead* II, iii, 7. III, i, 5, and *Ecl. Proph.* 55, 1. *Exc. ex Theod.* 70.

¹⁶ Plut. 589B. *Enn.* IV, iii, 18.

¹⁷ *St.* VII, 37, 2. Pp. VI, 34, 3.

¹⁸ Cf. *St.* VII, 49, 7, with *Enn.* V, viii, 11.

¹⁹ *St.* VI, 156, 5. Marc. Aur. has *ὁ θεὸς πάντα τὰ ἡγεμονικά γυμνά ὀρεῖ* (XII, 2. Cf. IX, 34, X, 1).

²⁰ Max. Tyr. 17, 9, has *ὅλον ἀθρόον ἀθρόα συντάσει*.

Plot. III, viii, 9. V, v, 7, has *ἀθρόα προσ-ἐπι-βολή*.

V, v, 10: *ἀθρόως ὁ προσβάλλων*.

²¹ *Paid.* I, 28, 1. Sen. *Ep.* 94, 5. 18. Max.

Tyr. 16, 3. *Enn.* V, v, 7.

²² *Paid.* I, 30, 2. Cf. Max. Tyr. 17, 11. *Enn.* V, v, 7-8.

²³ To Professor Dodds here as on many other points I have been much indebted.

of heart, i.e. in our popular sense of 'conversion,' the term *epistrophe* is common enough in Biblical Greek.¹ But in various writers the meaning that the word bears is that of a turning around of the mind, an 'intention' of the will and intellect, perhaps the only sense that Plotinus, for example, attaches either to *ἐπιστροφή* or *ἐπιστροφήναι*. Doubtless the clearest use by Clement of the term in this sense is to be seen in *St. VII*, 43, 5: 'It is therefore possible to utter prayer without even a word, only stretching inwards all the spiritual faculty upon intelligible utterance in undiverted *epistrophe* towards God' (*συντείνοντα μόνον ἔνδοθε τὸ πνευματικὸν πᾶν εἰς φωνὴν τὴν νοητὴν κατὰ τὴν ἀπερίσπαστον πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐπιστροφήν*). The same view is expressed by Clement in saying that by the strength of the Logos a man is drawn and his whole system is brought into unity.² For, like Plotinus, he sees that by *epistrophe* the mind becomes a unity both with itself and with God. 'Let us by being made good pursue unity, seeking out the Good Monad,'³ and 'That Pythagorean saying was spoken mystically in regard to us "that man must likewise become one," since the Archpriest is Himself one.'⁴ The Gnostic is 'made one with the Spirit' and his friendship with God is evinced by unity, *τῷ ἐνὶ χαρακτηρίζεται*.⁵

Philosophic *epistrophe* owes its development to the Stoics and the Platonists. Thus when Seneca writes 'Licet reuerti in uiam, licet in integrum restitui, restituiamur,' or when Marcus Aurelius expresses the view that man, although cut away from the unity in nature, may grow together with it by returning to his inward unity, and writes *εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφον*,⁶ the thought is itself unmystical but none the less important for later mysticism. Compare also a well-known passage where Seneca inveighs against the mere externals of religion: 'Facis rem optimam et tibi salutarem si perseueras ire ad bonam mentem, quam stultum est optare, cum possis a te impetrare . . . prope est a te deus, tecum est, intus est . . . sacer intra nos spiritus sedet.'⁷ Clement himself refers to the *μεταστροφή εἰς τὰ θεῖα*, in which the Stoics believe (*SVF* III, 221), and implies that this is identical with the Platonic view in *Republic* 521c. The Platonists use *epistrophe* in the same way as Clement. Thus Albinus regards God as *ἐπιστρέφων πρὸς αὐτόν* the Nous and the Soul of the Cosmos,⁸ Maximus refers to the soul of the good man as *ἐπιστρέψασα εἰς ἑαυτήν τὸν νοῦν*,⁹ Celsus urges that the soul be ever strained (*τετασθῶ*) towards God,¹⁰ and Plotinus, who continually practised the habit (its importance is stressed by later Neoplatonists),¹¹ writes: *δεῖ ἐπιστραφῆναι εἰς τὸ εἶσω πάντα*.¹²

I am here forced to omit one important phase of Clement's Hellenism, the influence of Stoicism on his ethical teaching and especially in his portrait of the Gnostic.¹³ But perhaps enough evidence has been brought forward to show the

¹ E.g. *Malachi* 3, 7. *Matth.* 18, 3 (cf. *Strom.* III, 88, 1).

² *St. V*, 80, 9. Cf. *IV*, 9, 5. ³ *Pr.* 88, 2.

⁴ *St. IV*, 151, 2. Following occur (a) a pun on *θεῖν* and *θεός*. Cf. *Plat. Crat.* 397d. *Protr.* 26, 1; *Plut. Mor.* 375, 880b; *Ocell. Luc.*, p. 20, l. 9, Harder; pp. *Theoph. ad Autolyc.* I, iv. (b) An 'anchor' simile which Theiler (146, n. 2) traces back to Posidonius (but cf. *Hebrews*, 6, 19).

⁵ *St. VII*, 44, 5, 68, 1.

⁶ *VIII*, 34, 48. *IX*, 42.

⁷ *Ep.* 41. *Epistrophe* in Epictetus is found often meaning 'cura,' sometimes in its philosophical sense (*Ench.* 10, 41. *Dis.* I, 4, 18; *III*, 16, 15; 22, 38-9; 21, 23; 23, 16, 37; *IV*, 4, 7).

⁸ *Didash.* 165³, 169³². ⁹ 16, 3.

¹⁰ *Orig. Cont. Cel.* 8, 63, and cf. *Tert. Orat.* 3.

¹¹ *Porph. Sent.* 7, Momms., etc., ad *Marc.* 24. Cf. *De Abst.* I, 29: *εἰς τὸν ὅρως ἑαυτὸν ἀναδρουή*, where Reitzenstein (*Hell. Myst.* 184) sees 'starke

Benutzung östlicher religiöser Begriffe,' on the ground that the idea of 'das Selbst, das Ich' cannot be expressed in Greek. But in fact Porphyry's expression is by no means exceptional: see *Dio Prus. Or.* XX, 8 (*ἡ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναχώρησις*) and *Marc. Aur. VI*, 11. *VII*, 28. *VIII*, 48. See further for *epistrophe* Sallustius 4 and 14. *Procl. Inst. Th.* 31. *In Tim.* 65. *In Alcib.* 103a.

¹² *Enn.* VI, ix, 7. See *Vit. Plot.* 8 ad fin. 9, *ἡ πρὸς τὸν νοῦν τάσις*, and *Enn.* I, ii, 4. 6κ. I, iv, 11κ. I, vii, 1. II, ii, 3. II, iv, 5κ. III, iv, 4. III, vii, 12. IV, iv, 2. 37. V, i, 12. V, ii, 1. V, iii, 1. 6. 13. 16. V, iv, 2. V, viii, 11. VI, vii, 16. 31. 37. VI, viii, 6. VI, ix, 2. Theiler connects *epistrophe* both with Antiochus of Askalon (*op. cit.* 42) and with Posidonius (*ibid.* 149).

¹³ *Ennead* I, iv deserves to be studied along with the later *Stromateis* in this connexion. For *Clem. (St. V, 16, 5)* and *Marc. Aur. (VI, 8)* the perfect man 'creates himself.'

close connexion that exists between his ideas and those of Greek philosophy. I have always tried to keep in view that Clement owes allegiance to a religion of revelation, and that this constitutes a cardinal difference between him and, for instance, Plotinus. I have not raised the question of his orthodoxy.¹ I have not sought to decide his success as a thinker.² I have throughout considered him as a Hellenist, and from this viewpoint I believe that the study of Clement, in conjunction with that of Plotinus, is likely to be most fruitful. The question of a direct relation between the two appears impossible to settle. Dr. Inge doubts any immediate influence of Alexandrian theology upon Neoplatonism. 'In reformed pagan circles,' he says, 'it seems to have been a matter of good taste not to mention Christianity.'³ But Numenius spoke of Jesus, giving an allegorical interpretation, and Amelius, as we have seen, was acquainted with the Christian Logos-doctrine. Perhaps, however, the many resemblances between Clement and Plotinus do not necessitate the assumption of dependence, and this paper will have shown that most often there is the possibility of a common source. If that is granted, then the problem of Posidonius remains to be faced, and it will be evident that I am disposed to allow his influence on several features of Clement's Hellenism. There is some truth in Mr. R. M. Jones's view that 'to assume that Posidonius was the only channel through which the commonplaces of the poets and the philosophers flowed down to later antiquity is preposterous.'⁴ But, when I consider Clement, I find it difficult to dismiss as commonplaces those ideas which can most plausibly be connected with Posidonius, and I am therefore led to regard Posidonian doctrine as the basis for some important features of Clement's Hellenism.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

R. E. WITT.

¹ For an unfavourable view see *Hast. Dict. Rel. Eth.* II, 702.

² Dr. Inge (*Hast. op. cit.* I, 314) finds 'an ardent and impetuous imagination joined to a serene soul and a clear intelligence.'

³ *Ibid.*, p. 308. If so, perhaps comparison may be made with the absence of all specific mention in the *Enneads* of the Stoics, who for all that influence the Plotinian system profoundly.

⁴ *Cl. Phil.* XXI, 98, in a searching investigation, which must be reckoned with in any discussion of Posidonius, and in which doubt is thrown on the conclusions reached by Schmekel. But even if many of the arguments in Schmekel's pioneer work are invalidated, there seems enough evidence to show that some of the leading ideas in later philosophy go back to the platonizing Stoicism which Posidonius originated.

TR
Fo
greatly
in the l
For ma
oversta
the ren
seemed
purpos
means,
confine
(a)
(b)
(c)
(d)
and La
O
such f
combin
meanin
repres
There
The w

¹ Mr.
present
which
whethe
whethe
sitting
ἀκρίτως
idea is
phrases
to a c
make t
the boy
we can
tion.
it, fails
parties
refer a
least b
depart
boy w
nearest
ἐν βόσ
μεχολ

philosophy.
a religion
him and, for
I have not
red him as
in conjunc-
of a direct
any imme-
med pagan
to mention
erpretation,
os-doctrine.
us do not
that most
n the prob-
disposed to
some truth
ly channel
d down to
difficult to
ected with
e basis for

WITT.

g investiga-
in any dis-
ch doubt is
y Schmekel.
Schmekel's
ems enough
ading ideas
platonizing
d.

THE FOX AND THE GRAPES.

THEOCRITUS I. 49:

ἄ δ', ἐπὶ πῆρρα
πάντα δόλον κεύθουσα, τὸ παιδίον οὐ πρὶν ἀνήσειν
φατὶ πρὶν ἢ ἀκράτιστον ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι καθίξῃ.

For a very long time I have held a view of this sentence which differs very greatly from any which I have seen advocated elsewhere. Mr. Campbell's discussion in the last number of *C.Q.* will render it possible to abbreviate my presentation of it. For many of Mr. Campbell's criticisms on page 99 are, I believe, sound, if occasionally overstated. Many will agree, with some hesitations, in his methods of disproving the rendering 'set him breakfasting upon dry stuff' on page 98. This has always seemed to me a bad rendering for quite other reasons. Unfortunately for my purpose, which is not to expose modern misrenderings, but to find out what ἀκράτιστον means, much is immaterial. Mr. Campbell's real objections to ἀκράτιστον seem to be confined:

- (a) To an alleged 'active' sense.
- (b) To an alleged equivalence with a 'present' participle.¹
- (c) To a violation of a law which he attributes to Mehlhorn.
- (d) 'It is the only occurrence of ἀκρατίζομαι (with congeners) outside Comedy and Late Prose.'

Of these the last point (d) is admitted. But early uses of the word are rare, and such facts are of very small value. Moreover, the objections given only work in combination. There is no reason to suppose that the word ἀκρατίζω (with whatever meaning) was excluded to Theocritus. There is no objection to a verbal in -τος representing a middle as in Theop. Com. fr. 41 περίστατον βοῶσα τὴν κόμην ποιῇ. There is nothing against a verbal in -ιστός in Theocritus, who certainly has μακαριστός. The word ἀκρατίζω seems definitely parallel to σιτίζω, except that it starts with an

¹ Mr. Campbell's 'full current sense of a present participle' is a man of straw. The fox which steals my hens does not wait to see whether I breakfast next day on bacon only, nor whether I eat my porridge standing (*Scotice*) or sitting (*Anglice*). The sense demanded is (μὴ) ἀκρατιούμενον or οἷον (μὴ) ἀκρατίζεσθαι. Such an idea is, however, foreign to language; for phrases like οὐχὶ παύσομαι look forward always to a complete and not a future result: 'till I make thy enemies thy footstool.' The fox leaves the boy still asleep; it is only the fox of whom we can predicate a state of completion or repletion. Mr. Campbell's suggestion, as he translates it, fails on this most simple canon. Of the three parties—fox, wallet, and boy—it is hardest to refer ἀκράτιστον to the boy. The wallet may at least be in a state of depletion at the time of departure. At the time of καθίξῃ, moreover, the boy will be waiting still for breakfast. The nearest phrases are such as in Arr. *Epict.* II. 16 ἐν βοῶς κοιλίᾳ καθήμενος ἐκδέχων σοῦ τὴν μάμμην μέχρις σε χορτάσῃ (Herodes VII. 47 sq.). But

clearly 'turn him into one who waits for manna to drop,' an 'idler,' though the only possible sense of pre-breakfast or pre-supper sitting, has nothing to do with Theocritus. If I agree with Mr. Campbell to blow up the Houses of Parliament, it is one thing to remain till the fuse is alight, and quite another to wait till the explosion occurs. The commentators on this passage (Wordsworth included) introduce an unexampled *terminus ante post quem* unknown elsewhere in the literatures or common parlances of the world. The only exceptions are some who read ἀκρατισμόν. There are three things which can 'sit' or 'be seated': (a) part of a dish, (b) part of mechanism (as Homer's mills), (c) a ship (Pind., Polyb.). The last is the only sense available. With (c) we have (i.) a poor correction, (ii.) a doubtful case after ἐπὶ, (iii.) a tasteless metaphor in the mouth of a terrene animal. But at least we avoid the wild insanity of the *terminus ante post quem* if we translate 'till he has sunk the breakfast' (in his Syrtis of a belly).

a privative. If Callimachus could use *σιτίζεαι*, why deny to Theocritus *ἀκρατίζ*—? As to Mehlhorn's law, there is no evidence of its application to verbs of this order. Actually *σιτιωτός* and *σιτευτός* refer to animals which have been fed, like 'peach-fed' hams. Mr. Campbell says: 'I have little doubt that this horror has owed its survival in current editions largely to its wholly deceptive resemblance to a privative.' (Mr. Campbell, I trust, has no enemies. If he has, they will surely combine this rather petulant remark with his note, p. 98 (2), and accuse him of deriving the word from *ἀκρός*.) Such arguments, unless backed by an exhaustive survey of the evidence, have little weight. If a schoolboy writes (as they often do) *ἐπροθυμείτο*, he does so because the verb is derived from *πρόθυμος*, and has a 'wholly deceptive resemblance' to a verb in *προ-*. Yet here *ἐπροθυμείτο*, and not *προϋθυμείτο*, is the 'horror.' And if it be a 'horror,' the Alexandrines seem to me fairly rich in such horrors—*ἀποτάκτους*, for instance, in Herodes III. 69, if you give it the straightforward sense of 'disobedient.'

How can Mr. Campbell ascertain to what extent the negative sense was present in the mind of a Greek when he said *ἀκράτιστος*, even when—a quite arbitrary assumption—he meant thereby 'breakfasting'? I can find few criteria. It is indeed a point on which I am inclined to agree with Mr. Campbell; but his case is certainly not proven. *ἀσφάλιστος* is passive; *ἀτίμαστος* is passive; but *ἀθήριστος* is 'active' in sense. In all these cases the negative, as in *ἀκράτιστος*, belongs to the basic adjective. Are these wholly deceptive? I do not feel myself at liberty to say more than that, like Mr. Campbell, I do not like the translation 'breakfasting.' But my chief objection is that such a translation begs the point. Athenaeus, who wished to show (*mutatis mutandis*) that the Greeks of the fifth century B.C. did not have 'supper' (I choose an English word of the same double meaning), but had only three meals, from his marvellous library and erudition found two or three places where 'sup' may mean 'to have dinner.' You can quote from Dio Cassius (LXV. 4) to show that it can mean 'to have "supper." ' But the normal meaning is *ἄκρατον πίνειν*, as in *Ar. Plut.* 295 *τράγοι δ' ἀκρατιέεισθε* (for goats can 'sup' things), and in a fragment quoted by Pollux (who [VI. 24] is concerned with the derivation of the word), and naturally quotes the sense applicable for his point 'to take liquid (or fruit) only, or in a lump.' 'What is the matter? Have you had nothing but *κοκκύμηλα* to sup?' (So, too, there is no hint of a special meal in the old proverb (App. IV. 28) *ὄξος ἡκρατισμένον: ἐπὶ τῶν ὀργίλων καὶ δριμυτάτων*, which suggests 'soused' as a fair translation for this sense of *ἀκρατίζω*.) The matter is obvious if you go to a French music-hall, or read *Philogelos* 243, who in this connexion has *ἀπλῆς τῶς φαγῶν σῦκα καὶ σταφυλὰς*—mark the negative. But Pollux definitely says that the word was used *καὶ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει*, which is comparable to his use of *νέοι* in VII. 24 to include Aeschylus. Perhaps, therefore, the word is older as well as later than Attic comedy, and, except where there is an allusion to time of day, the negative is well marked. Thus Philo (IV. 247, Cohn) has *εἰ γ', ὦ πάνσοφε, μόνος ἀμειγοῦς ἡκρατίσω σοφίας*, and, what is more to our purpose (VI. 29, Cohn) *τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἄριστον τῶν ἐκεῖ ταύρων καταθίσας Διὶ πρόφασιν εὐωχείτο, πολλὸν δ' οἶνον ἐμφορήσας ἀθρόον εἰ μάλα κατακλιθεὶς ἡκρατίζετο*. There is no suggestion whatever of time, or even of an empty stomach. Hercules 'supped it up like a good 'un,' leaving nothing, stuffing himself up with drink. Merely on the question as to whether the *ἀ* privative is felt, even a half-Greek a little later than Theocritus appeals to me as a sounder authority than a contemporary lexicographer with a special point to prove, or a foreigner twenty-two centuries later. As to the possible inventor of *ἀκράτιστον* we have Sophron, who wrote much about breakfast, or the source of Horace's 'irriguus mero.' If Mimnermus liked *ἀτίμαστος* he may have liked *ἀκρήτιστος*. For all these reasons I can say, not as a provable fact, but only as a personal impression, that *ἀκράτιστος* might mean 'supped' (passive as we say 'dined') or 'stuffed' with

liquid,
is one
and th

L
ally² v
frame
line, th
the sta
Of cou
say κα
ἀκρατι
senten
It

in Gre
certain
There
Hung
viszed
-on (p
ξηροῖς
object
especi
bon),
μή ποτ
μενοι.
[Imagi
The fo
senten
surely

(a
ordina
subjec
would
ordina

(
high-l
Isaac
schola
Bergk
of a g
I do n
tain t
elemen
they h
tainly
propos
correc

¹ As
commo
nothing
boy can
He mig
² See

THE FOX AND THE GRAPES

liquid, fruit [or (*per ridiculum*) some moral quality]. To these two renderings there is one grave and, you will say, fatal objection. The fox is the subject of the sentence, and the fox is not going to give the boy his supper nor to stuff him with anything.¹

Let us now turn to *καθίζει* (Mr. Campbell's note 6). *καθίζειν* may be used generally² with participle (or infinitive?) of an actor who from the stage induces a certain frame of mind or its expression in onlookers. Even if the other words here fall into line, there is, you will say, one fatal objection. The boy is the actor in the centre of the stage. The fox may weep or laugh. But 'the fox is the subject of the sentence.' Of course this is not the only use of *καθίζειν* with a predicate. You can say and do say *καθίζειν τινα δικαστήν*. The fox is the subject of the sentence, however, and *ἀκρατιστήν* will not scan. *ἀκράτιστιν* would, but 'the fox is the subject of the sentence.'

It remains to consider *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι*. This actual phrase does not, I fancy, occur in Greek. It could mean 'on the top of dry food.' It could perhaps (though not so certainly) mean 'on dry land.' But the phrase is not foreign to *language* itself. There is a language into which *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι* can literally be translated. When the Hungarian says 'you shall not get away with it' (go scot-free), he says 'azt nem viszed el szarazon.' *azt* is *illud*, *nem non*, viszed el 'you carry off,' *szaraz-ξηρ-³*, and -on (post-position commonly used adverbially) *ἐπί*. Why should not *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι* = *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι* (τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς?) = (roughly) *γελῶντα* or *ἐπιχαίροντα*? At first sight there is no objection in the very common ellipse of *ὀφθαλμός* (Headlam on Herodas, pp. 254, 290) especially as the use of *καθίζειν*, mentioned by Mr. Campbell (see Wordsworth, Casaubon), appears to demand the word *κλαίοντα* or its negation. Theognis (1217) enjoins *μή ποτε πᾶρ κλαίοντι καθεζόμενοι γελᾶσωμεν τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀγαθοῖς, Κίρν', ἐπιτερπόμενοι*. Clearly, too, some mention of eyes is likely in a picture (as in the Philostrati [*Imagines*] *passim*). But to this idea there is, as you will see, a quite fatal objection. The fox will chortle, not the boy. Everyone agrees that the fox is the subject of the sentence. It is odd how this difficulty crops up at every turn. Can it be—why! surely not—that the subject of the sentence is the boy?

(a) There is, of course, no rule in Greek that the subject of the main and subordinate clause is the same; you need merely look at Hom. Φ 199. Nor that the subject of the subordinate clause is near: see for instance Hom. α 41. Indeed one would expect τὸ παιδίον, which is first in the main clause, to be subject of the subordinate clause.

(b) That we have been told so by others great or small, scholars or pedants, high-brows or low-brows, clever men or others. The scholiast, Casaubon himself, Isaac Voss, Warton, the learned Toup, Wordsworth the founder of Theocritean scholarship, Valckenaer and Hesus, Siebels, Brunck, Gaisford, the great Theodore Bergk,⁴ Ahrens, Fritzsche, Meineke, Hermann, Ameis, Hartung, Wilamowitz (relic of a greater age), Legrand, Gow, Campbell, Edmonds, and I know not whom beside. I do not know what effect these names would have had on Theocritus, but I am certain that they frighten you. Can it be that they have all of them made the most elementary mistake? Or is it not rather, because of that elementary mistake, that they have failed to find one suitable rendering, even one suitable correction? Certainly it will appear in the sequel as if, quite apart from the rendering which I propose, we are now faced, not with a blank wall, nor the necessity of desperate corrections, but with an embarrassing number of attractive side-walks, and the possi-

¹ Assume by some curious juggling with commonsense that *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς* could mean 'on nothing' or 'on the remains.' Obviously the boy cannot be said *ἀθρόον ἀκρατίζεισθαι* τὸ λοιπόν. He might nibble it tearfully.

² See Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* What Mr. Campbell

states as a rule has, however, exceptions.

³ It is, I believe, the same word etymologically as it certainly is in use.

⁴ Who suggested *ἀκράτιστον* (impugned by Lobeck).

bility of satisfying the most hypercritical with a small and perhaps needless correction of half a letter. We need not *θρηνεῖν ἐπ' ὁδὸς πρὸς τομῶντι πήματι*, nor wield the knife with Mr. Campbell's ruthlessness. At the worst a tiny stitch and all is sound.

(c) That one cannot say *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς*. To this, purely as a grammatical point, I agree,¹ and hence have not discussed cases of such an ellipse. Purely from the grammatical point of view *ἐπὶ τοιοῦτοις ὀφθαλμοῖς* is an unusual expression. But everything conspires to make *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς* intelligible of the eyes; even at *πάντα δόλον κεύθουσα* we should ask what point this has *pictorially*; and the answer is easily supplied by Aesch. *Cho.* 734 *θεοσκυθρόπων ἐντὸς ὀμμάτων γέλων κεύθουσα*, while for the use of *ἐπὶ* we have (e.g.) Eur. *I. A.* 1175 *ἐπὶ δὲ δακρύοις μόνῃ κάθημαι*. Therefore *ξηρὸς* becomes in sense *ξηρόφθαλμος* and takes on this idea. One can, after Mr. J. M. Keynes' original, speak of a 'hard-faced' discussion in parliament. In any case such ellipses are often used with a purposeful vagueness. Most to the point is Soph. *Ant.* 88 :

θερμὴν ἐπὶ ψυχροῖσι καρδίαν ἔχεις.

What is the ellipse in *ψυχροῖσι*? Is *ἐπὶ*, so to say, perfect *ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῦ τεθνηκότος μέλεσι*? Or present *ἐπὶ τοῖς τῆς πόλεως πάθεσι*? Or future *ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ σοῦ βουλευόμενοις ἔργοις*? Certainly, I should say, all of these. It is a pretty chilly business all round, and the ellipse suits this.

(d) That the normal ellipses of, or ideas of, *ξηρός* are different and concrete. This is true. But there is always a wide range of meaning in these vague adjectival plurals. *δεινὰ* will illustrate this best; but the word most akin to *ξηρός* has the double meaning which I assume for *ξηρός*. *σκληρά* can equally well mean 'hardships' or 'cruelty' (Soph. *O.C.* 774). So you may if you like merely equate *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς* to *ξηρῶς* as *ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς* to *αἰσχρῶς* (Eur. *Hipp.* 511).

(e) That *καθίξῃ* could only take the present participle. This is clear nonsense. It could take (*mutatis mutandis*)² any or all constructions of *κάθημαι* or *καθίξιν*, as for

¹ With some hesitation. There are many phrases like *ἐξ ὑπερτέρας χερσὶς, ἀφ' ἡσυχου ποδὸς, ἐξ ἐνὸς ποδός*, where the preposition more accurately defines what the dative could have expressed (Soph. *Phil.* 91, Jebb). Including the (possible) ellipse of a part of the body, and actually with *ἐπὶ* we have Hes. *Op.* 750 *ἐπ' ἀκινήτοισι καθίξειν* (τοῖς μέλεσι (?)). That this was the sense I do not affirm; but it may be so. *ξηρά* was in fact the opposite of *δάκρυα*, and you may take as a parallel Eur. *fr.* 322 (as cited by Plutarch) *ἔρωι γὰρ ἄργον καπὶ τοιοῦτοις ἔφω* (compare Philodemus *A.P.* v. 120, cited by Meineke), where the facile explanation 'an ellipse of *ἔργους*' can hardly serve. In Eur. *Med.* 928 we have *γυνὴ δὲ θήλυ καπὶ δακρύοις ἔφω*, and here in Theocritus we have the reverse *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς*. If you insist on supplying *ἔργους* in the first (illogically), you can supply *δακρύοις* here; I do not think you will be right, but any explanation will serve all three places. In Eur. *I. A.* 541 (the parallel will hold whether the verses are genuine or not) we have *ὡς ἐπ' ἐλαχίστοις δακρύοις πρᾶσσω κακῶς*. In my view *ἐπὶ ξηροῖς* could certainly mean *ἐπὶ μὴδ' ἐλαχίστοις δακρύοις*. But I do not wish to dissuade the reader from an understanding of *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι* by insisting on any one supplement which conflicts with his or her cherished ideas on any or all of such passages. For the sense it matters very greatly whether you accept the equation *ξηροῖς*=(roughly) *δάκρυοις*; but after this it

matters only slightly whether you supply *πράγμασι* (τοῖς παροῦσι), *ἔργοις* (πολεμικοῖς), *βλεφάροις*, *σινίοις*, *βλέμμασι*, *ἔδωλοις*, *τροπαίοις*, or what you will. In all cases no tears are shed, 'things' are dry, the meal is a free meal, and the fox gloats.

² E.g. *κάθημαι* *ἐκτέης*, *καθίξω* *τινα* *ἐκτέην*. *καθίξω* does not of course mean, as Mr. Campbell supposes, to sit, or seat to breakfast. The customs of the Medes and Persians, which C. cites, though they alter not, were not those of the Greeks. Aulus ate his crust from the floor because the guest took his chairs, or else in a flood of tears. (Why does C. conceal the authorship of this poem?) But the rustic boy may have remembered the rules of decency which bade him sit at meals. The proper citation for Aulus' experience is Hom. *h. Merc.* 284 *ἐπ' οὐδεῖ φῶτα κάθισσε*, but at neither place is Ebeling (*Lex. H.* 611a) or Jacobs right in referring to Theocritus. The fox was not running away with the wall, and not even Mark Twain in his most Yankee mood could have alleged so. It should be emphasized that the Greek man sat to row or to gamble, to weep or to wait, to chat or to cobbler, to judge or to supplicate, and a hundred other purposes; but to 'sup' never, except perhaps on active service. Therefore, if *καθίξω* could refer to the boy, we should have to take it as a sign of modesty or dejection. For the fox it has obvious applications—to his future (lack of) tears (*καθίξιν μὴ δακρύουσαν* for *μὴ καθίξιν*

instance ἐπὶ (δακρύοις), or ἀκλάντος. We have no warrant for saying anything more definite as to its construction, though in sense we cannot take it as a mere synonym for θῆ, ποιήσῃ. For even if we could we should have a hopelessly prosaic expression, worthy rather of St. Luke than Theocritus.

(f) That a beast cannot weep. Actually the fox weeps as a result of poor or indiscreet feeding twice in Babrius' fables. So do many other beasts weep—elephants, for instance (Ael. N.A. X. 17), and asses (XIV. 10).

(g) That beasts do not καθίσθαι. There is an element of truth in this. Either ἔσση or a vaguer word is usual in prose or verse narratives. I regard καθίς- as conditioned primarily by ἐπὶ ξηροῖς (= ἀδακρύτοις), and secondly by the obvious necessity of rest after a heavy meal (Ael. V. 39 ὅταν δὲ ὑπερπλησθῇ κενοὶ ἑαυτὸν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἀσιτίᾳ): though here either κείσθαι or καθῆσθαι would serve.

(h) That a fox cannot ἀκρατίζεσθαι. Ar. Plut. 295 alone disproves this. But there would be a real oddity in the mention of ἀριστον or ἀκρατισμός where δείπνον is the typical meal, and πρὶν ἢ εὐδειπνον would serve for sense. It is much better to suppose that ἀκρατ- refers to the quality and quantity of the meal and not to the time.

(i) That ξηρὸς is not precisely equivalent to ἀκλάντος or ἀδάκντος. This is, I think, true; but it is hardly an objection. Rather it is the motif of the phrase. Not, I think, of every one could a Greek say ἐπὶ ξηροῖς. Otherwise the exact phrase would occur. An examination of true parallels will, I believe, show what Theocritus is aiming at. The obvious and often quoted parallel is in Aeschylus, *Septem* 682:

ἀρὰ
ξηροῖς ἀκλάντο[ι]ς ὄμμασιν προσιζάνει
λέγουσα κέρδος πρότερον ὑστέρον μόνου,

where the curse sits ever watchful and gloating; and κέρδος perhaps suggests κερδῶ the crafty watcher. For dry eyes in the main suggest sleeplessness: Agathias (A.P. V. 280) ἡ δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ κάμνει αὐαλέοις ὄμμασι τηκομένη, Julian. *Aegypt.* (ibid. XVI. 113. 7) δάκρυα δὲ ξηροῖσιν ὑπὸ βλεφαροῖσι παγέντα ἴστανται, ἀγρύπνου σήμα δυσηπαθίης, Glaucus (XVI. 111) ἐν τε γὰρ ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐσκληκόσι κωφὸν ὑποικεῖ δάκρυ, and perhaps in Eur. *Or.* 389 δεινὸν δὲ λείσσεις ὀμμάτων ξηραῖς κόραις. It may be objected that here reference is to sleeplessness through grief or mental agitation, but such an objection does not hold: Adamantius (I. 332 Foerst.) has οἱ δὲ ξηρὸν (βλέποντες) κάκιστοι, ἀθέμιστοι. Fortunately we have the cycle of ideas aptly expressed by Plutarch (*vit. Arat.* 10) οὐ γὰρ μόνον, ὡς εἴκοι, θηρίων τινῶν ὄφεις ἐνεργοὶ διὰ σκότους οὖσαι μεθ' ἡμέραν ἀποτοφλοῦνται ξηρότητι καὶ λεπτότητι τῆς περὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν ὑγρότητος μὴ φερούσης τὴν πρὸς τὸ φῶς σύγκρασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεινότης τίς ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων . . . πρὸς . . . τὰς ἐπικρύφους καὶ λαθραῖους ἀναθαρσοῦσα πράξεις. The most foxy (εἴρων) of Greek heroes is described thus in Philostratus Jun. *Imag.* 1 (following Hom. *Γ.* 216): βεβυθισμένος τὴν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀκτῖνα διὰ πανουργίαν οἶμαι καὶ τὸ διαθρεῖν τι αἰεὶ (Philostr. *Her.* p. 717 κατηφῇ καὶ οἶον ἐπισκεμμένον), which reminds one of John Buchan's villain who hooded his eyes like a hawk. However precisely such eyes were signified by

δακρύουσαν) and to his good long meal like the κόλαξ σκώληξ, who (Anaxil. *fr.* 33) ἐσθίει καθήμενος—really 'sits down' to it, though you might take it for the attitude necessary to eat off the wall; but neither Plato (*Phaedr.* 254c), Xenophon's use of ἀνακαθίζειν, nor Aristotle's συγκαθ. are quite parallel. So in Ael. N.A. XVII. 9 the attitude καθῆται is stressed. There is no difficulty in referring to the fox in terms more apt to mankind, as Babrius often does. Nor is this use confined to Babrius. A beast does not normally καθῆσθαι, except on a tree (Ael. N.A. III. 21, v. 54) or a

roof (Herodes III. 41), and the word hence might be supposed to be confined to bears, monkeys, and the like. But it applies constantly to semi-human animals, like the Sphinx in Eur. *fr.* 540. The fox could not sit down to a meal, for that is not Greek language or usage. But a beast can (like a man) καθῆσθαι περιμένων (Plut. *Mor.* 972c), ἐλλοχῶσα (Ael. N.A. III. 21), or σιγῇ (*Myth. Aesop.* 176 (Paris): where τὰλλα μὲν καθῆστο σιγῇ appears to be iambic). So there is no difficulty in a beast sitting κλαίονσα or the reverse.

the worker, they are what Theocritus is thinking of; they express the ἀλώπηξ who πάντα δόλον κεύθει. They are the mark of the cunning plotter who has a lean and hungry look and does not sleep of nights. Aristotle's σκληρόφθαλμος is somewhat more technical. But it implies ἀσκαρδαμνκτ-, and ἀμνδραῖς ὄψεσι—both suitable to the bleary, unwinking watcher. Yet with all this shamming the fox is the most keen sighted of beasts—next to the prying neighbour (*Arp. Prov.* IV. 31).

(j) That this interpretation assumes too great obscurity. Not, I think, to the Greek reader, who would connect the κερδῶ with ξηροὶ ὀφθαλμοί. The whole is really an instance of the most common phenomenon in literature where the human body is mentioned—the combination of predicate, adjective, and ornate epithet. When the American magnate snaps his rat-trap jaws it means (a) that his jaws are that shape, (b) that they are so specially at the time, (c) that the victim is caught. But to return to eyes and to literature. When stout Cortes gazed with eagle eye on the Pacific, his eye was more than normally aquiline. In Horace the *sicci oculi* of the first mariner are induced by watchfulness; but it is a mark of bravery that he does not weep at peril, as did poor and timid sailors. So here in our case the eyes of the fox are naturally so from night prowling, specially so from his steady watch; and they will remain so when he has got and assimilated the booty at which, like a spectator at the theatre, he sits and gloats. He will not let him go till he be set gloating over a free sup.¹ It is a dry, pitiless, 'hard-faced' business all round.

(k) That this is all too complicated. I have merely analyzed the phrase, as I read it, and allowed, perhaps, too much weight to unsound objections and to physiological ideas. I should not demur if anyone merely translated 'sit him down to a good sup for nothing.' But I should only insist that καθίξη would be best explained if we understand (mentally rather than grammatically) ὀφθαλμοῖς with ἐπὶ ξηροῖς (= ἀδακρύτοις). I do not myself think it likely that there should not here be a second allusion to the eyes of the fox in the picture. Precisely how ξηροὶ ὀφθαλμοί would be shown I do not know; on the depiction of ὕγροὶ ὀφθαλμοί see Liddell and Scott, s.v. ὕγροί.²

It is true that once you grasp the fact that τὸ παιδίον is the subject of καθίξη other translations may become possible or at least worth examination: e.g., to 'set the fox supping on the top of a good feed' (reading perhaps ἀκράτιστον). But my own taste seems to appreciate a perfect picture conveyed by a rare economy of words. The spectator's dry eyes will be even drier. His lean belly will be distended. Admittedly the first word is a trifle comic, the next two a trifle tragic, and the last a trifle scenic. But why not? What have we here but a tragi-comic scene?

MORAL.—All commentators have made the most elementary error of identifying wrongly the subject and object of a clause. They have merely followed each other blindly. The moral seems to be that we commentators, though mostly not boys, are alas! mostly not foxes. We are indeed, mostly, sheep.³

COURNS WOOD, HUGHENDEN, BUCKS.

A. D. KNOX.

¹ Mr. Campbell may be right in objecting to ἡ after πρὶν. If so, I would suggest that it is part of a note, e.g. σημειωτέον ἡ ἀκράτιστος; 'note ἀκράτιστος feminine.' More probably it is inserted because some one dreamt of ἀκράτιστος, as did several Renaissance scholars.

² On ἀκράτιστον I would observe that it is probably intended pictorially. His stomach, now lean and hungry, is to be fattened. But I cannot be as certain as is Mr. Campbell of the passive sense. We have no knowledge as to whether ἀκραιζέσθαι in Doric would be middle

or passive; it is merely a matter of dialect, as in the case of ἀλλιζέσθαι. On the accent I am rather uncertain, but all such words may be of only two genders, and this is the main point.

³ The reasons for supposing the boy to be the subject and the fox the object of καθίξη with ἀκράτιστον (or -ιν) predicated of it, whatever ἐπὶ ξηροῖς may mean, may be summarized as follows:

(a) In normal Attic prose (as opposed to Ionic?) the subject of the subordinate clause is normally the latest available noun. I say 'available' so as to include relative sentences

where
obliqu
263
claus
(b)
furth
ξεν
which
(c)
(Hdt.
σαντα
τελευ
versio
come
πρὶν
(715),
dicat
the o
fox.

PRO

Arist
happ

that
comm
sligh

claus

supp

15a 8

63a 3

C

where the latest noun may be taken up in an oblique case of the relative. In Theocr. XXV. 263 the accusative is the subject of the *πρὶν* clause (inf.).

(b) The boy is already sitting, and cannot be further or otherwise seated. Examples of *καθί-ξεν* 'glue to seats' are not relevant to *καθί-ξεν*, which should give a motion to a seat.

(c) As in the most famous saying with *πρὶν ἂν* (Hdt. I. 32 οὐκ *σε* [δλβιον] λέγω *πρὶν ἂν* τελευτήσαντα καλῶς τὸν αἰῶνα πύθωμαι with *πρὶν δ' ἂν* τελευτήσῃ ἐπισχέειν μηδὲ καλέειν κω δλβιον and most versions) we expect the main important word to come first and receive only slight modifications. *πρὶν ἢ ἀκράτιστ- κ.τ.λ.* must = *πρὶν ἂν ἀκρατίσται* (715), and there may be a secondary sense predicate (as [roughly] *προῖκα* and *καλῶς* above). Now the only person who gets a real *ἀκρατισμός* is the fox. If *ἐπὶ ξηροῖσι* (roughly 'on little or nothing')

is the true predicate, it should come first. *ἀκράτιστον* would (*pro tanto*) be conceivable, but I believe it has no authority whatever.

(d) *πρὶν* is temporal, and the only person whose 'supping' bears any relation to the time of relaxation of the fox's vigilance is the fox itself. The fox does not care three hoots when the boy eats.

This issue of time seems to me all important. The time is such period, after the boy's dozing off, as will allow the fox either to sup up (*ἀκράτιστιν*) or to have been soused with (*ἀκράτιστὸν*) what she is after. Without precisely agreeing with Mr. Campbell or with others, I prefer to leave the issue as to which of the two forms is correct, whether even *ἀκράτιστος* glosses a word meaning 'supped,' and what, when and where the fox hopes to eat, undiscussed.

PROSE RHYTHM AND THE COMPARATIVE METHOD.

MR. SHEWRING, C.Q. XXV. 14, gives statistics of the clausulae favoured in Aristotle's *Ethics*. I have applied them to test a few conjectural emendations that I happen to have published, with the following encouraging results:

(a) Emendations that substitute a good clausula for a bad one:

96a 18 ὕστερον λέγομεν for ὕστερον ἐλέγομεν K^b, ὕστερον ἔλεγον cet.

96b 5 ἑαυτοὺς ἀφέλκειν [δεῖν].

48a 14 ἀκόλαστον τίθεμεν [καὶ ἐγκρατῇ καὶ σώφρονα].

63b 13 τὴν φιλίαν [καθάπερ εἴρηται].

71a 35 αὐτῶν <ἡδονῇ> εἶναι (the crasis gives - ο - -: some additional figures that Mr. Shewring has been good enough to send me show that this is the second commonest clausula in normal Attic prose, and that in the *Ethics* its frequency is slightly above the normal).

(b) Emendations that substitute one good clausula for another:

97a 9 τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο for τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀγαθόν K^b, τὸ αὐτὸ ἀγαθόν or αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν cet.

25a 22 τῶν ἀγαθῶν [καὶ ἀγνοεῖν ἑαυτόν].

I may be pardoned for omitting my one or two alterations that substitute a bad clausula for a good one.

My text adopts a MS. variant, or a conjecture of another scholar, similarly supported by Mr. Shewring's test in the following places: 99b 6, 02a 20, 10b 31, 15a 8, 20a 22, 20b 2, 22a 28, 32a 11, 33a 1, 34b 33, 50b 34, 53a 1, 59a 3, 61a 2, 63a 3, 64a 23, 66a 34, 75a 6, 79a 22.

H. RACKHAM.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. LI. 4. October-December, 1930.

T. Frank, *Roman Census Statistics from 508 to 225 B.C.* Argues for the reliability of the early census figures on the assumption that Pliny's statement, that the list of 392 B.C. included all the *capita libera*, is correct and applies equally to all lists before 332 B.C. H. Bennett, *Vergil and Pollio*. Reviews the career of Pollio, and suggests that his guiding principle was friendship, first for Julius Caesar and afterwards for Antony. Infers from this (1) that Pollio took no active part in the restoration of Vergil's lands, (2) that the political situation made it impossible for the child of Octavian to be the subject of Eclogue IV. if that poem were designed to please Pollio, (3) that the same criteria may be used for dating the other eclogues. C. E. Van Sickle, *Particularism in the Roman Empire during the Military Anarchy*. Suggests that the political disintegration of the period between the murder of Alexander Severus and the accession of Diocletian was due to the re-emergence of local patriotism among groups of peoples (such as Celts, Thracians, Semites and Egyptians) who were throwing off their imperfectly assimilated Graeco-Roman culture and ideas; this was rendered inevitable by the changed conditions of military service dating from Hadrian's employment of *numeri* and by the series of almost simultaneous attacks upon the various frontiers. P. B. Whitehead, *A New Method of Investigating the Caesura in Latin Hexameter and Pentameter*. Discusses the question whether the Caesura was actually a pause, and concludes that it was not, because difficult or unpleasant consonant combinations do not appear to be allowed at the caesura unless a definite sense pause coincides with it. Gives statistics for the combination *sn* in certain passages of Vergil and Ovid. J. E. Harry, *Medea's Waxing Wrath*. Proposes $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi' \acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\iota\chi\omicron\iota$ for $\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi' \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota$ in *Medea* 106. A. W. Van Buren, *The Text of Two Sources for Campanian Topography*. Proposes *uenarumque* for the corrupt *denarumque* in Statius *Silvae* III. 5, 104, and finds in the line a reference to the mineral springs of Stabiae, which were held to be beneficial to the circulatory system; brings Florus II. viii. 4 into line with the description of the manoeuvre given by Plutarch and Frontinus by re-punctuating (with a comma after *montis* instead of after *Glabro*).

LII. 1. January-March, 1931.

F. E. Brown, *Violation of Sepulture in Palestine*. Re-examines the Nazareth inscription (in the collection Froehner) and concludes that it is a private copy of an imperial rescript on the subject of $\tau\upsilon\mu\beta\omega\rho\upsilon\chi\iota\alpha$, belonging to the reign of Hadrian, and made in the interest of the settlements of non-citizen and non-Jewish veterans which existed in various parts of Galilee: appends a note on the language of the inscription. J. W. Hewitt, *Gratitude to Parents in Greek and Roman Literature*. Examines a number of passages, chiefly from Seneca, and concludes that the ancients conceived the duty of child to parent as a matter of *pietas* (civic or religious duty) rather than of the more intimate and personal relationship involved in modern conceptions of filial gratitude. H. C. Nutting, *Notes on Lucan*. Considers the following passages: (1) III. 39 sqq., suggesting that *mors ipsa* refers to Julia herself, the meaning being that for all her semblance of existence she is powerless to harm; (2) V. 533 sqq.,

where *manibus* is dative, and *inopem duxisse senectam* parallel to *cuncta*, a grammatical explanation which renders it unnecessary to assume a lacuna; (3) VI. 722 sqq., holds that the negative in *non posse mori* can best be explained on the supposition that the meaning is equivalent to *ne posset mori*; (4) IX. 1079 sqq., collects parallels, both with and without *sed*, for an 'adversative statement' following an apodotic subjunctive; (5) X. 22 sq., explains the tense of *servatus erat* as a reference to the actual time of Alexander's burial. Sister A. C. Way, *On the Authenticity of the Letters attributed to Saint Basil in the so-called Basil-Apollinaris Correspondence*. Argues that neither in thought nor in language do these letters agree with the genuine epistles of Basil, and concludes that they are deliberate forgeries. K. Scott, *On Seneca's Apocolocyntosis IV*. Suggests that this chapter, with its promise of long life for Nero, is in effect a parody of similar passages in Court poets, especially Ovid.

Mnemosyne. LVIII. 3. (1930.)

J. G. P. Borleffs: Did Lactantius write the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*? concludes (1) that the work was written shortly after 316 A.D.; (2) the several 'clausulae' belonging to each class occur in approximately the same proportion in this work as in the undoubted works of Lactantius; (3) in the Parisian MS. the work is assigned to Lactantius; and (4) we have also the testimony of St. Jerome. B., however, thinks that the similarity in the use of 'clausulae' may be due to an imitator: he is impressed by the poverty of thought and poorness of style of the *De Mortibus*. If Lactantius is not the author it is probable that either St. Jerome or the scribe of the archetype of the Paris MS. made a mistake which the other copied. B. A. van Groningen, *De Syleo Euripideo*. Eight fragments of this satyric drama are preserved, five of them in Philo Judaeus. Van G. argues that these five have been cited in their original order, and proceeds to deduce therefrom a portion of the plot of the play. Van G. has a note also on Soph. Fr. 442 N. καὶ πλήρης ἐκπιόντι χρύσειον κέρας | τρίψει γέμοντα μαλθακῆς ὑπ' ὠλένης (these last two words being a conjecture of Musurus for ἵπολαινης). The play was entitled *Pandora*, and van G. argues that δσκόν must have occurred in the previous line: hence the translation: 'and (for me) when I have drunk dry the golden bowl, she (Pandora) will squeeze the wineskin under her soft arm,' the speaker being probably Silenus. C. C. van Essen, *De Cyclope et Cuclu*, basing his study on the work of Eva Fiesel, *Namen d. griech. Mythes im Etruskischen*, argues: the pre-Indo-European peoples of the period we call Helladic I. knew a god of death Cuclup, dwelling in a cave. A maritime wandering hero, 'Uthisse,' descends to this cave with followers, some of whom he is compelled to leave behind. In the second millennium B.C. the first Indo-European peoples arrived with a legend which involved the 'Noman' stratagem. From a conflation of these legends 'Uthisse' developed into both Οὔτις and Ὀδυσσεύς (by association with ὀδύσσεσθαι), and the original 'catabasis' was attached to the other adventures of the *Odyssey*. E. de Waele: *The Use of the Conjunction Sive in Tacitus* shows that whereas in *Dialogus* T. employs the conjunction in the same manner as Cicero, i.e. simply to indicate alternatives, in the *Annals* and *Historiae*, with one exception (*Hist.* II. 78, quod paras, seu domum exstruere seu prolatare agros . . . datur tibi), the conjunction is used to indicate alternative explanations of an action, and of these explanations the latter gives Tacitus' own opinion. L. A. W. C. Venmans: λευκοὶ μύρμηκες refers to Aelian N.A. IV. 5: λευκοὺς δὲ μύρμηκας ἐν Φενεῶ τῆς Λακωνικῆς ἀκοῦεν πάρεστιν, and Paus. III. 26, 2-3 (Laconica), who speaks of an island Pephnos off the coast of Laconia, where οἱ μύρμηκες λευκότερον ἢ ὡς μυρμηκῶν τὸ χρῶμα φαίνονται. As only one Pheneos is known to us (the Arcadian), V. thinks that Aelian took his information from Pausanias and in doing so fell into error. He notes that Paus. does not call the ants λευκοί, but uses the comparative λευκότερον κ.τ.λ. He thinks λευκότερον simply means *splendidus, nitidus*. Ch. Ch. Charitonides has notes on the

Paroemiographi and C. Brakman on *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*. H. H. Mallinckrodt, on Soph. *Electra* 444 sq. ὥστε δυσμενὴς | ἔμασ' ἑλίσθη κατὰ λουτροῖσιν κόρη | κηλίδας ἐξέμαξεν, argues that by cutting off his arm the slayers tried to deprive the murdered Agamemnon of the means, and by wiping off the blood upon his head they hoped to allay his desire for vengeance. The blood is the life, and in restoring the blood there is, from the standpoint of magic, a restoration of the life-stuff.

LVIII. 4. (1930.)

J. C. Naber continues from the previous volume his *Observationum ad papyros iuridicas*. K. van der Heyde, *Plus, Minus, Amplius, Longius*, continues his study of the constructions used with these words by classical authors. That e.g. *plus decem uiri* is normal, *plus quam decem uiri*, or *plus decem uiris* exceptional, is a commonplace. Van der Heyde examines the usage of the authors one by one, and seeks to show how each exceptional case is to be explained and what shade of difference in meaning underlies the difference in form. J. H. Thiel, *De feminarum apud Doros condicione*, discusses their conjugal relations in the light of the evidence of Xenophon, Polybius, and Plutarch relating to the Lacedaemonians, under the heads of 'procreationis adiutorium,' promiscuity, and polyandry. (1) It was an old Indo-European custom that in case of sterility of husband or wife the procreative functions might be performed by deputy. Anaxandridas (Hdt. 5. 40), however, being a King, could not obtain legitimate offspring in this way, and consequently was allowed to practise bigamy, ποιεῖων οὐδαμῶς Σπαρτιατικά. (2) The licentiousness charged against Spartan women did not arise from this ancient custom, but from the conditions of the military life lived by the men. (3) Polyandry at Sparta arose as a means of checking the increase of population when the State was economically decrepit. F. Müller has a note on the pronunciation of Latin. From the passage Cic. in *Pisonem*, § 52, 'Me consequentibus diebus in ea ipsa domo qua tu me expuleras, quam expilaras, quam incenderas, pontifices, consules, patres conscripti me collocauerunt,' M. argues that the pronunciation was not *qu'expilaras*, *qu'incenderas* but *quam expilaras quam incenderas*—so that in these words there seems to be an echo, i.e. a fainter repetition, of the beginning of the sentence. J. de Zwaan, *Neograeca ad Hypotheticam Marci Evangelistae Latinitatem*, in controversy with F. C. Burkitt and C. H. Turner (*Journal of Theological Studies*), argues that the apparent Latin order (of ending clauses with the verb) is not due to the gospel being translated from Latin, but is a 'neo-graecism,' and taking the relevant passages compares them with three modern Greek versions. He also cites a grammar of modern Greek for the rules under which the examples come. W. E. J. Kuiper on Eur. *Phoen.* 516, πᾶν γὰρ ἐξαυρεῖ λόγος | ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολέμιον δράσειεν ἄν, maintains by an analysis of the context that ἐξαυρεῖ to Euripides meant 'expugnat.' C. J. Brakman ('*Mélanges Paul Thomas*') comments on Castiglione's annotations to Apuleius, *Metam.* I.-III., contributed to that volume. F. Müller, *Iterum de Caeculi nomine Observatio*, returns to his theme that the Virgilian Caeculus ultimately = Cacus. In his former paper he had been forced to assume that the Etruscan form of Cacus would be Caecus. He now refers to Festus, p. 328L. 'quorum subiecti qui fuerint t̄caeximparumt̄ uiri unicarumque uirium imperio montem Palatium in quo frequentissimi consederint appellauisse a uiribus regentis Valentiam, etc. He accepts Havet's emendation *Caeci importuni uiri*, etc. Cacus, he adds, is in Livy 1, 7, 5 'ferox uiribus.' In a second article F. Müller offers an emendation of the corrupt passage in Festus (p. 285L.) which he corrects to read <Properi>e(m) Cato prosapiem dicit ut <antiqui s litteram in roborem et ar>bores loco r dicebant . . . proprie mari opus est. B. A. van Groningen gives a list of corrections derived from the photographic reproductions of *cod. Parisinus 2033* and *Coislinianus 161* to be made in the *apparatus criticus* of Susemihl's Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1887) of the second book of Aristotle, *Economica*.

Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung. VII. 1-4. 1931.

(1) J. Stenzel, *Was ist lebendig und was ist tot in der Philosophie des klassischen Altertums?* Emphasizes the central importance of Plato, and the significance of the latest thought of Plato and the earliest of Aristotle. J. M. Nielen, *Augustinus*. A warm appreciation of the thought and personality of Augustine. (2) R. Harder, *Studienfragen in der klassischen Philologie*. A critical discussion of the present state of classical teaching in German universities. H. Oppermann, *Caesars Stil. Commentarius* (ὑπόμνημα) was a type between collection of material and artistic history, characterized, in theory, by strict adherence to facts. Caesar first and alone gave the type real independence. It exactly suited his genius for the objective presentation of events, and his admitted simplifications and rearrangements of reality are not tendentious, but due solely to his insistence on the essential. (3) W. v. Wartburg, *Grundfragen der etymologischen Forschung*. Emphasizes the complexity and variety of the influences which affect the history of words, and the necessity of studying exhaustively all stages of their development. F. Wassermann, *Das neue Thukydidesbild*. Discusses the leading ideas of Thucydides and their expression in the speeches in connection with recent analyses of the composition of the history. (4) H. Windisch, *Unser Wissen um Jesus*. A careful examination of Eisler's 'Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς, admitting the difficulty of some of the problems raised, but decisively rejecting the more startling of his conclusions. A. Lesky, *Die griechische Tragödie in ihren jüngsten Darstellungen*. A critical review of some of the chief post-war contributions to the criticism of Greek tragedy.

Philologus. LXXXV. (N.F. XXXIX.) 2. 1930.

G. Senn, *Hat Aristoteles eine selbständige Schrift über Pflanzen verfasst?* Thinks neither internal nor external evidence enough to show that A. wrote a treatise on botany. B. Snell, *Das Bewusstsein von eigenen Entscheidungen im frühen Griechentum*. Answers E. Wolff's critique (in *Gnomon* 1929) of S.'s article in *Phil. Suppl.* XX, 1 on the origin of the idea of the self as determining agent among the Greeks. N. Greipl, *Über eine Ptolemäerinschrift*. Would read (with other small changes) Ἀρσινόη for Ἀρσινώη in OGI 16 (from Halicarnassus), thus making A. not the dedicatrix but the part-dedicatree, and so bringing the date down from a possible 308-6 (Dittenberger) to after 271-0. The dedication being in part to Serapis, this re-dating will alter our views on the time of the introduction of the Serapis cult into Asia Minor. F. Geyer, *Euboia in der Wirren der Diadochenzeit*. Sketches the history of E. from the end of the 3rd cent., showing periods of immunity from, and subjection to, Macedonian overlordship. J. Zehetmeier, *Die Periodenlehre des Aristoteles*. Examines Ar. *Rhet.* III. 8 and 9. Commentators have misinterpreted A.'s definition of ἡ ἐν περιόδοις λέξις. To understand it aright A.'s aesthetic doctrine must be studied (to be continued). J. Zellinger, *Die Proömien in der Vita Porphyrii des Diakons Marcus und in der Religiosa Historia des Theodoret von Cyrus*. Shows that not only most of the introduction but also part of the subject-matter of the R.H. of Th. is borrowed from Marcus' Life of Porphyrius of Gaza.

MISCELLAN: 9. F. Eckstein, *Philologisches zum Kalenderaberglauben*. Disapproves of any attempt to see in *uleriotos* (in *MG. script. Merou.* iv. 705, 12) any reference to *Gebildbrote*. Would read '*alios iocos*' from v. l. *iotticos*. 10. K. Latte, *Zeὺς τελεσιουργός*. Shows from three inscr. that Z. T. is the god to whom sacrifice is made by a new priest at his ordination. This throws light on Hesych. *τελεσιέργον παιᾶνα* which has been wrongly emended to *τελεσιέρων*. 11. W. Morel, *Zu Lukrez*. Would read *minaci* = 'from the boaster,' in *Lucr.* 3. 42.

LXXXV. (N.F. XXXIX.) 3. 1930.

C. Fensterbusch, *Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des athenischen Dionysostheaters im V. Jh.* Criticizes J. T. Allen's reconstruction as set out in various articles in

Univ. of California's *Publications in Class. Philol.* (1918-23) and gives his own view: that the orchestra was moved early in Vth cent. some 14 yds. N.W. of original position; that a terrace was then built on which the σκηνή (tangential to, and not cutting, the circle of the orchestra) developed; and that the addition of *parascenia* dates from the time of the Lycurgan building only. R. Harder, *Prismata*. (1) The Orphic fragment (No. 21a in Kern's collection) is not only not early, nor even merely Stoic in tone (Wilamowitz), but is actually a Stoic forgery. (2) For his attack on Manicheism Alexander of Lycopolis quotes from a Greek original Manichean document. (3) Speusippus' Letter to Philip (*Ép. Socrat.* 30. 5) is not an 'open letter' as the recent editors (Sykutris and Bickermann) hold, but a private one. J. Zehetmeier, *Die Periodenlehre des Aristoteles* (continued). Deals with A.'s definition of *periódos* in general, then of the π. ἐν κύλοις (making the point that there are never more than two κύλοι), lastly of the λέξις εἰρομένη)(λ. κατεστραμμένη. L. Wickert, *Homerisches und Römisches im Kriegswesen der Aeneis* (to be continued). Examines Vergilian (1) helmet, which he finds of Corinthian type (i.e. neither Mycenaean skull-helmet nor R. legionary type); (2) shield (always—with two exceptions—round); (3) armour—chain or scale as in R. army, not Homeric. E. Müller-Graupa, *Zu Seneca's Apokolokyntosis*. (1) Explains *mera mapalia fecistis* (9. 1) = 'you are undisciplined.' Approves of Friedländer's correction of *aut numera mapalia* (Petr. Sat. 58. 13) to *at nunc mera mapalia*. (2) Derives *Apokolokyntosis* from *ἀποκολοκυντέω = to cease to be a κολοκύντη (pumpkin or fool) or perhaps ἀποκολοκυντόομαι = cease to be hydrocephalous. J. Strouz, *Textprobleme aus Quintilian*. In 1. 3. 14 would read (with A. and B.) *iniuriae* for vulgate *iniuria*, taking *quod* = *quia* and removing the parenthesis: 'and <thirdly> because it amounts to (*conuenit*) . . . an actionable injury.' In 1. 4. 10 for *fieri si non aliqua officio* would read *fieri, si uocales quae officio*. In 6. 1. 35 thinks that Q. wrote *quam* <consules> *duos Kal. ianuariis*. In 3. 11. 16 S. defends the text, re-punctuating. In 8. 4. 29 emends *non propriis sed translatis* to *n. p. nec t.* In 8. 6. 33 deals with *locus desperatus* discussed by Colson (C.Q. XVII [1923] pp. 185 *et sqq.*). Prefers *παρηγμένα* to old edd.'s *παραγόμενα* for *πεποιημένα* (recent edd.), supports Haupt's *arquitentem*)(Colson's *arquitollentem*, and suggests that the nonsensical *adoinoia et uio eo* stands for some Gk. compound containing *οἶνον*, while *ocoeluditino-bono* is to be read as its explanation: *hoc est ludit uino bono*. Would read *nos* for MSS. *eo*.

MISCELLAN. 12. E. Fraenkel, *Eine Formel des Vortrags im Senat*. To the formula used by Claudius in his speech to the senate (BGU. 611) *si uobis placent, statim significate . . . ; sin displicent, alia reperite. . .* F. quotes as parallels Plaut. *Epidic.* 263 and Hor. *Ep.* 8. 6. 67. 13. L. Radermacher, *Philologisches zum Kalenderaberglauben*. Agrees with Eckstein in seeing no reference to *Gebildbrote* in *toticos*. Quotes Schuchardt as connecting this word with ital. *zotico*, a fool.

Revue de Philologie. LVI. 4. 1930.

M. Holleaux, *Sur un passage de Phlégon de Tralles*: in frag. 36 (III) 8 Jacoby for *Αἰνίωνων* read *Αἰνίων* (cf. Livy 38. 41. 4). This is another sign of his source's good historical information. J. E. Harry, *Notes sur les tragiques grecs*, interprets Soph. O.T. 198-9 τέλει . . . ἔπ' as 'what night spares, comes to completion by day.' On *Ant.* 606 supports *παντογῆρος*; conjectures involving a hunting metaphor are out of place. *Ibid.* 1232 *πύσας προσώπῳ* means not 'spitting in his face,' but 'pulling a face of contempt,' cf. Fr. *consuever*. On Eur. *I.T.* 98 proposes *ἐκβηρόμεσθ'* ἀπ' ὧς ἂν οὖν μάθοιμεν ἂν, on *Ion* 1424 *ἰδοῦ' | τόδ' ἔσθ' ὕψος*· ἀθέσφαθ' ὡς εἰρίσκομεν. A. Cordier, *De quelques procédés du style épique*, criticizes Moseley's *Characters and Epithets, a Study in Vergil's Aeneid*, as suffering from undue restriction of view. The epithet, as such, is a characteristic of poetry; its varying use in different genres and different authors might be an interesting study. Examples. R. Eisler, *La ponctua-*

tion du prologue antimarcioniste à l'Évangile selon Jean, proposes the following text: *Euangelium Iohannis manifestatum [et datum] est ecclesiis [in Asia] ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine Hieropolitanus [discipulus Iohannis carus (mistaken and misplaced gloss)] in exegeticis [idest in extremis] quinque libris retulit, descripsit uero euangelium, dictante Iohanne recte uerum, Marcion haereticus. cum ab eo fuisset improbatu eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est ab Iohanne. is uero scripta vel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.* According to this the Evangelist was John the Elder. The association with him of Marcion is illuminating for early Church history.

LVII. 1. 1931.

M. Holleaux, *Tite Live*, argues against Klotz that Livy 33, 30. 8 is pure fabrication, not a record of a Roman demand made and abandoned during negotiations. *Ibid.* 10 on *Attalo absentis elephantos dono datos* Klotz tries to save Antias' reputation by explaining *absenti* as meaning *mortuo*—Roman elephants, not the non-existent Macedonian ones, were given to Attalus' successor. H. rejects this; the elephants are copied from the events of 188 (38, 39. 5). *Ibid.* 6: the origin of this paragraph is uncertain, but not Claudius. J. Humbert, *Le Pamphlet de Polycratès et le Gorgias de Platon*, attempts to discover the content of Polycrates' κατηγορία Σωκράτους by a comparison of Libanius and Xenophon. Argues that P.'s attack must have been the occasion of the *Gorgias*. The famous misquotation of Pindar is intentional. Socrates must have quoted the lines correctly to warn young men against false and immoral interpretations of the poets; Polycrates, who charged Socrates with always choosing the worst passages of the poets in order to discredit the traditional education, misquoted to point his attack. What is said of Callicles in the dialogue fits well with what we know of Polycrates; if not a portrait, Callicles is intended to recall him. The *Gorgias* probably follows immediately on *Rep.* I.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. LXXIX. 3. 1930.

E. Loew, *Das Lehrgedicht des Parmenides*. Heraclitus' work was the immediate occasion of Parmenides' poem. A. Busse, *Xenophons Schutzschrift und Apologie. Memorabilia* I, cap. 1-2, § 8 is a purely Xenophontine account, truth with Xenophon's own explanatory additions: I, 2, §§ 8-16, and §§ 49-64 written as an answer to Polycrates and added later: I, 2, §§ 17-48 later still, and influenced by Alcibiades dialogues of Aeschines and Antisthenes. The *Apology* (genuine) is later, with borrowings from many sources, including Plato's *Apology*, and Xenophon's own earlier work: the result, an impossible portrait. F. Oertel, *Zur Frage der attischen Grossindustrie*. An examination of details and general thesis of Schwahn 'Demosthenes gegen Aphobos.' Attic industrial activity was elementary in its methods of production, and, except for the mines, was not practised on a large scale nor regarded as suitable sole employment for capital. W. Heraeus, *Ein makkaronische Ovidfragment bei Quintilian*. Emendation of Quintilian VIII, 6, § 33: 'at "οἶνοιο" et "βιοῖο" ferimus in Graecis, Ouidius ioco cludit uineo bonoeo: dure etiam iungere "arquitenentem" et diuidere "septentriones" uidemur.' Ausonius uses Ovid's alleged ending in a maccaronic poem (p. 401, Schenke): and cf. Ennius 'Metteo Fufetioeo.' Some notes on the Ausonius poem follow. E. Bickel, *Apollon und Dodona*. A commentary on *Aetna* 'seu tibi Dodone potior' (*Aetna* written after Manilius and before A.D. 63). Lactantius, *diu. instit. epit.* 10, p. 688, and Arnobius, *adu. nat.* 2, 68—both perhaps using Cornelius Labeo—along with Strabo, *Epit.* 7, 1, 1, speak of Apollo as source of Dodona-oracles. Th. Birt, *Martiallesungen*. E. Schwyzer, *Axt und Hammer*—on the meaning of πέλκxvs in Anacreon (*fr.* 47, Bergk).

MISZELLEN.—H. Vorwahl, Fig-leaf and fig symbolism.

LXXIX. 4. 1930.

E. Schwyzer, *Zur FHEΔΙΣΤΑΣ-Inschrift*. Linguistic notes on inscr. published *Mnemosyne* N.S. 57 (1929), 206-34. FHEΔΙΣΤΑΣ = ἰδιώτης. R. Hennig, *Herodots 'goldhütende Greifen' und 'goldgrabende Ameisen.'* Greek trade and trade-routes into S. Siberia, Mongolia, and the Far East. Herodotus' griffins depicted in finds: Arimaspiā = land between the Ob, Altai, and Yenissei. The gold-digging ants of 3, 102 are a local animal of marmot-type: and the district is either Tibetan plateau or near Gobi desert. Both were gold-producing areas, and trade was probably kept in hands of local tribes, hence the fairy-tales. Carl Clemen, *Die Tötung des Vegetationsgeistes in der römischen Religion*. Discusses with parallels the sacrifice of the horse in October and the *Argeorum sacra*: in both it is the *Vegetationsgeist* which is destroyed. C. Fries, *De E Delphico*. E is the Sumerian word for temple or house. F. Cornelius, *Die Partie des Peisistratos*. The written evidence supports the strong historical probability that Peisistratos' party was largely composed of the city-masses. F. Schachermeyr, *Die rōmo-punischen Verträge*. The 2nd treaty of Polybius, unlike the 1st, follows a common Carthaginian-Greek type, and, being less advantageous to Rome, must have been accepted by her when she assumed overlordship over a Greek trading city, probably Naples. Suggests dates (1st treaty of Polybius 348, 2nd 306, 3rd 278) with circumstances and reasons. R. Zimmermann, *Die Zeit des Geschichtsschreibers Curtius Rufus*. Curtius X, 9, 3 sqq. will not fit Vespasian; Curtius is the same as the *rhetor* of Suetonius' list, i.e. he lived under Tiberius and Caligula. The passage of Curtius fits Caligula. W. Heraeus, *Drei Fragmente eines Grammatikers Ovidius Naso?* Two of the *fragmenta dubia* of Ovid, and one gloss, emanate from a grammarian calling himself Ovidius Naso, Ovid the poet being termed always by grammarians Ovidius simply. R. Philippson, *Nachtrag zu den Panectiana*. Brings *Pap. Oxyr.* XI, 1367 into line with the thesis of *Rhein. Mus.* 78, 344 sqq.

MISZELLEN.—B. Warnecke, *A Fragment of Naevius, Agitatoria*: was spoken by a *Senex* to his wife. W. Morel, *Catalepton 2 fin.* should read (in spite of E. Reitzenstein, *Rhein. Mus.* 79, 65 sq.) *ita omnia ista verba*. D. Mülder, notes on *Catalepton 3*.

LXXX. 1. 1931.

D. Mülder, *Ithaka nach der Odyssee*. A refutation of Dorpfeld's interpretation of *Od.* IX, 16-26. The description of Ithaca is coloured by imitation and influence of the *Iliad* rather than by the geographical realities. Cephalonia disappears from Odysseus' realm in the *Odyssey* because of the metrical inconveniences involved. Ithaca's western situation is a result of the blessed land of Phaeacia's being naturally thought of as in the East. Notes are appended on (1) *Od.* I, 22 sqq.: the noble Aethiopians were an imaginary creation to prevent the Olympian love of the Aethiopians from being attributed to the Western Negroes: (2) *εὐδείλος*: (3) Homeric use of *αὐτός*. K. von Fritz, *Zur Frage der Echtheit der Xenophontischen Apologie des Sokrates*. Maintains that the work is spurious. (a) The historicity of the account of Socrates' assessment of his punishment cannot be maintained when compared with Plato's. (b) The account of Anytos is careless patchwork, influenced by Plato's *Meno* and Antisthenes. (c) Socrates' conversation with Hermogenes is much more naturally related in the *Memorabilia*. (d) The account of the *daimonion* is based on a mistaken interpretation of the account in the *Memorabilia*. L. Weber, *Eleusinisches*. Discussion of cult-history of Eleusis on basis of Noack's work. Distinguishes between τὸ ἀνάκτορον (= curtained adyton in the Telesterion) and τὸ μέγαρον (= temple of hymn to Demeter 270 sqq.). The *ὄπαλον* is a raised structure above the ἀνάκτορον, its side-walls containing outlets for the smoke of the torches used for illumination in the rite. H. Fuhrmann, *Zur Lebensgeschichte alexandrinischer Gelehrter im I Jahrh. der*

römisch
Claudi
to the
κατ' ἐγ
Synesi
briefly
M
was the
ὠκεανέ-

Ri
A.
poeta sa
the per
author
and XI
49-8 B.
Valla.
the lon
The wr
del Περ
a papy
Its sub
the cou
problem
compar
upholds
Kaudos
belong
dialect
G. De
ceding
paid by
by Pto
onoraria
in hono
p. 9 sq
Moesia
O. Tos
Cat. 8
unquali

Inc
A.
Compar
from O
of lingu
Mod. G
vowels
(Blähv

römischen Kaiserzeit. Traces the lineage of Ti. Claudius Archibios mentioned in Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians (A.D. 41). O. Immisch, *Necare*. The transition to the meaning 'to drown' was caused by a popular belief that drowning was death *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, destruction of soul as well as body. The belief traced in Homer, Synesios, Propertius, Ovid, etc. B. Warnecke, *Römische Theaterzustände*. Traces briefly the Roman attitude to the theatre.

MISZELLEN.—H. Lewy, *Zu griechischen Glossen.* *Idem*, "Ἀρχων διγῶνος. Such was the Palestinian equivalent for ἀρχων τὸ δεύτερον c. A.D. 200. Georg Méautis, *Zur ὤκεανέ-Akklamation*: a note on E. Peterson, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1929, p. 221.

Rivista di Filologia. N.S. VIII. (1930) 4

A. Rostagni, *I primordii dell' evoluzione poetica e spirituale di Virgilio*: I. *Virgilio poeta satirico e giocoso*. This is a study of Vergil at Cremona, Milan and Rome during the period before the Civil War, when he was under the influence of Catullus. The author discusses *Catalepton* X., the 'Ballista' epigram, and *Catalepton* VI., XII. and XIII.: in the last of these 'Caesar' is Julius, and the poem is to be dated 49-8 B.C. P. Ercole, *I frammenti bodleyani della Satira VI. di Giovenale e i frammenti del Valla*. Lines 346-8 should be deleted as a misplaced derivative of lines 30 sqq. in the longer addition preserved by O. Both passages found in O alone are genuine. The writer propounds a theory of the history of the text. G. Coppola, *Una pagina del Περί Σικελίας di Filisto in un papiro fiorentino*. This is the first publication of a papyrus, said probably to have come from Oxyrhynchus, of the second century A.D. Its subject is the operations of Laches and Chariades (*sic*) in Sicilian waters during the course of the expedition sent out by Athens in 427 B.C. Its authorship and other problems are discussed in detail. A. Momigliano, *Il nuovo Filisto e Tuciddide*. A comparison of the new fragment with the narratives of Thucydides and Diodorus upholds the reputation of Thucydides. M. Guarducci, *Ordinamenti dati da Gortina a Kaudos in una iscrizione inedita di Gortina*. The inscription was found in 1927 and belongs to the early third century B.C. It is of considerable interest, both for its dialect and for the light it throws on Cretan history, political and economic. G. De Sanctis, *Epimetron*. The author points out that the text published in the preceding article provides what is probably the earliest instance of a tithe being regularly paid by the inhabitants of a free Greek city. The practice is perhaps to be explained by Ptolemaic influence in Crete. *Miscellanea*. I. G. De Sanctis, *Un'iscrizione onoraria del 'magister equitum' Teodosio*. In lines 9 sqq. of the inscription from Stobi in honour of the father of Theodosius I., published by R. Egger in *Byzantion*, V. p. 9 sqq., the Greek is to be taken so as to describe Theodosius as the saviour of Moesia, the terror of Mauretania and the scourge of Saxons and Alamanni. II. O. Toscani, *Nota epicurea: isotachia atomica*. The author quotes Simplicius in *Arist. Cat.* 8 (Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 205 sq.) and Lucretius, II. 238 sq. against the theory of unqualified isotachia. *Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. Pubblicazioni ricevute.*

LANGUAGE

Indogermanische Forschungen. XLVIII. Heft 1. 1930.

A. Debrunner prints his lecture (Weimar, May, 1928) on the relation between Comparative Philology and the Classics. E. Hermann, on *ὄνομα* (nom.), adds parallels from O. Ch. Slav. L. Weisgerber contributes a long critical review of recent studies of linguistic change. L. Spitzer: past tense forms with future force (examples from Mod. Greek, Spanish, Rumanian). G. Gerullis: on the formation of 'mixed' vowels (ə etc.) in all three positions, high, mid, and low, with laryngeal inflation ('Blä hvokale')—illustrated by X-ray photographs. A. v. Blumenthal: ἀσάμινθος, cf

Sumer. **asam*- 'water-jar,' river-name *Asamus*; *μήρινθος*, **mēr*- 'bow,' cf. *Μηρίωνης*. W. T. M. Forbes publishes some speculations on the Phaistos disk. H. M. Flasdieck traces the history of fem. *ō*-stems in Germanic. V. Pisani: the long final vowels of Gothic. A. Debrunner: *ōōs* fem. as a substitute for an *i*-stem in compounds (Skt. *sām-iti*- etc.), *u*-stem in *simplex* (Lat. *ex-itus*, etc., from this). Studerus: Goth. *manwjan*.

Heft 2.

H. Jensen writes an important article on the forms of the 1st and 2nd pers. pronouns in I.Eu. B. Rosenkranz: influence of locality (dialect) and the personal factor in the language of Thucydides and the older Attic orators (Münster Diss., 1929). R. Loewe derives *ἐκτόν* from dial. **sem-km̥tóm* by dissimilation (loss of *m* in first syllable). J. B. Hofmann cites parallels to *interficere* from Skt. and Germanic, but rejects Margadant's interpretation at Apul. *met.* 11. 24 ('unterbrechen'). A. Bretschneider discusses the construction and use of linguistic maps.

Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. 58 Band. 3-4 Heft, 1931.

This number contains rather more of interest for those whose study is the classical languages than is usually the case. R. Rau discusses at length the question of hiatus in Plautus. His article is in three sections dealing with the shortening of a final long vowel before an initial vowel, with synizesis, and with internal hiatus. He allows himself a wide scope in discussion, and deals with the modification by Latin writers of the rules they found in use in the works of their Greek models. E. Schwyzer contributes a long article in three divisions with four *Exkurse*, in which he endeavours to connect the final -*a* of certain Greek interjections (such as *σίρρα*, *ψίρρα*) with that of the names of certain of the letters of the alphabet in Greek. He derives the sound in each case from a neutral vowel or murmur. He discusses especially the name *sigma* and its connexion with the verb *σίζω* (which by the way appears in the list of contents by an unfortunate printer's error as *αίζω*), and the history of the word *alphabet*. In a short appendix he treats of the etymology of Greek *σῆφωv*. P. Maas contributes a short discussion of certain forms found in the Gortynian Code, and another on the phonetics of certain fragments of Corinna. W. Brandenstein answers a point made against him by A. Nehring in his article on *Dependent Sentences* in the last number. Slavonic Collectives are dealt with in a long article by J. F. Lohmann. E. Fraenkel discusses points of Baltic morphology. H. Lommel has an article on the functions of Zarathustra, in which he disputes a point made by Hertel in his work on Zoroaster. Finally H. Oertel reviews the third volume of J. Wackernagel's *Altindische Grammatik*.

Allen (T. W.)
Anaxagoras
physics,
Anderson,
Areopagus,
Aristophanes
52 ff.
Aristotle, m
Attic socie

Bacon (J. H.)
nautica, 1

Campbell (L.)
foxes, 90
Clement of
Conway (R.)
Craig (J.)
Auctus,

Demotioni

Egnatius o
Eupatridai

Farnell (L.)
ode, 162
Fletcher (J.)
more Liv

Garnons W
of Gorgi
Gorgias, bi

Iolaos and

Knight (W.)
of the V
Knox (A. I)

Latin marg
Lindsay (W.)
Livy and t
Logos-doc

Orphic Arg

Peck (A.)
physics,
Pindar's de
Plotinian I

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Allen (T. W.)**, Miscellanea, 23 ff., 146 ff.
Anaxagoras: predication as a problem in physics, 27 ff., 112 ff.
Anderson, W. B., Livy and the *lexica*, 38 ff.
Areopagus, the, 7 ff.
Aristophanes and Gorgias' mission to Athens, 52 ff.
Aristotle, meaning of *ἁποτομειν* in, 34 ff.
Attic society: Demotionidai, 129 ff.
- Bacon (J. R.)**, the geography of the *Orphic Argonautica*, 172 ff.
- Campbell (A. Y.)**, the boy, the grapes, and the foxes, 90 ff.
Clement of Alexandria, the Hellenism of, 195 ff.
Conway (E. S.), the site of Vergil's farm, 65 ff.
Craig (J. D.), Terence quotations in Servius Auctus, 151 ff.
- Demotionidai**, 129 ff.
- Egnatius of Florence**, edition of Vergil by, 73 ff.
Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus, 1 ff., 77 ff.
- Farnell (L. R.)**, Iolaos and the ninth Pythian ode, 162 ff.
Fletcher (G. B. A.), Latin *marginalia*, 49 ff.; more Livy not in the *lexica*, 165 ff.
- Garnons Williams (B. H.)**, the political mission of Gorgias to Athens in 427 B.C., 52 ff.
Gorgias, his political mission to Athens, 52 ff.
- Iolaos and the ninth Pythian ode**, 156 ff.
- Knight (W. F. J.)**, homodyne in the fourth foot of the Vergilian hexameter, 184 ff.
Knox (A. D.), the fox and the grapes, 205 ff.
- Latin marginalia**, 49 ff.
Lindsay (W. M.), *pugilum gloria*, 144 f.
Livy and the lexica, 38 ff., 165 ff.
Logos-doctrine of Clement, the, 198 ff.
- Orphic Argonautica**, the geography of the, 172 ff.
- Peck (A. L.)**, Anaxagoras: predication and physics, 27 ff., 112 ff.
Pindar's death, epigram on, 121 f.
Plotinian Logos, the, and its Stoic basis, 103 ff.
- prose-rhythm and the comparative method, 12 ff., 211
pugilum gloria, 144 f.
- Rackham (H.)**, prose-rhythm and the comparative method, 211
Rose (H. J.), the epigram on Pindar's death, 121 f.; Iolaos and the ninth Pythian ode, 156 ff.
- Servius Auctus**, Terence quotations in, 151 ff.
Shewring (W. H.), prose-rhythm and the comparative method, 12 ff.
Solon's political changes, 1 ff., 77 ff.
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS:**
 Language, 62 ff., 127 f., 218
 Literature and General, 57 ff., 123 ff., 212 ff.
- American Journal of Philology**, 57, 212
Classical Philology, 57 f., 123 f.
Eranos, 124 f.
Glotta, 62 f., 127 f.
Hermes, 59 ff., 125
Indogermanische Forschungen, 219
Mnemosyne, 125 ff., 213 f.
Neue Jahrbücher, 127, 215
Philological Quarterly (Iowa), 63
Philologus, 215 ff.
Revue de Philologie, 216 f.
Rheinisches Museum, 217 f.
Rivista di Filologia, 61 f., 219
Wiener Studien, 63 f.
Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforschung, 64
- synizesis** (*ῥὸν ῥὸν*), 97 f.
Synoikia, the, at Athens, 8, 9 f.
- Terence quotations in Servius Auctus, 151 ff.
Theocritus, the boy, the grapes, and the foxes, 90 ff., 205 ff.
Theseus and the Eupatridai, 3 ff.
- Vergil's farm, the site of, 65 ff.
Vergilian hexameter, homodyne in the fourth foot of the, 184 ff.
- Wade-Gery (H. T.)**, Eupatridai, Archons, and Areopagus, 1 ff., 77 ff.; Attic society—Demotionidai, 129 ff.
Witt (R. E.), the Plotinian Logos and its Stoic basis, 103 ff.; the Hellenism of Clement of Alexandria, 195 ff.

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

- Aeschylus** :—
Agam. (330-2), 95
Cho. (734), 208
P.V. (731), 182
Sept. (682), 209
- Aesop** :—
 293 (Ch.), 96
- Anaxagoras** :—
 (fr. 4), 31; (fr. 6), 117; (fr. 10), 32; (fr. 12), 116; (fr. 15), 30, 31; (fr. 16), 30
- Andocides** :—
Myst. (15), 141
Peace (33), 141
- Anecdota** (Bekker) :—
 i. p. 39 (l. 27), 93; (257), 77
- Anth. Pal.** :—
 vi. (22), 101; xi. (205, 4), 95
- Antiphon** :—
Herodes (11), 8
- Apollonius Rhodius** :—
Arg. i. (568), 172; i. (582, 594), 173; i. (955-58), 174; ii. (360), 176; ii. (373), 177; ii. (1246), 176
- Apuleius** :—
Hermag., 21
- Archilochus** :—
 (fr. 2), 126
- Aristophanes** :—
Ach. (633 ff.), 52 f.
Equit. (707), 99
Plut. (297-8), 93; (628), 99
Ran. (270), 181; (421), 99
 (fr. 198), 55; (fr. 216, 242), 53
- Aristotle** :—
Ath. Pol. (3. 6), 77; (7. 4), 80; (8. 2), 11, 77, 89; (13. 2), 79; (16. 8), 81; (19. 3, 22. 5), 80; (41), 6; (57. 4), 8; (fr. 381, 385, Rose), 3
de caelo (302a 28), 28, 115; (302a 31), 28; (302b 11), 29, 30, 35
de gen. et corr. (314a 18, 314a 24), 28
hist. an. (486a 5), 29, 34, 35; (499a 13), 24
Met. (984a 13 ff.), 112; (984a 13), 29; (1014a 26, b 14), 36
Meteor. (388a 13-20), 28, 30
Phys. (187a 24, 36), 32; (203a 19 f.), 115
Poet. (1449a 8), 100
Polit. (1273b 41), 85
Rhet. iii. (8), 18
- Arrian** :—
Epict. ii. (23. 5), 94
- Athenaeus** :—
 (113B), 95; (402-3), 135; (653D 4), 91; ix. (78) [Dorotheus], 85
- Caesar** :—
B.G. vii. (56. 5), 46
- Cato** :—
de agr. (141), 15
- Catullus** :—
 xvii. (16), 101
- Cicero** :—
ad Att., v. 9 (2), 43; ix. 7 (5), 169; xv. 26 (5), 43
ad Fam., vii. 14 (2), 167; vii. 30 (1), 170
de Inv., i. (64), 43; ii. (166), 144
in Pis., (52), 213; (85), 100
in Verr., ii. 4 (79), 44
N.D. i. (117), 42
Or. (39, 217, 219, 234), 18
pro Rosc. Amer. xxvii. (75), 95
Tusc. Disp. i. (99), 43
- Claudian** :—
Epigr. 30 (3), 41
- Clement of Alexandria** :—
Pr. 68 (2), 201; 88 (2), 202; 98 (4), (117) 2, 196
Str. i. 1 (1), 199; i. 51 (1), 196; ii. (74), 197; iv. 151 (2), 203; v. 81 (3), 201 f.; v. 82 (1), v. 103 (1), 198; v. 133 (7), 202; vi. 113 (3), 197; vii. 5 (2 ff.), 199 f.; vii. 9 (2), 198; vii. 16 (5), 196; vii. 37 (2), 202; vii. 43 (5), 203; vii. 47 (6), 200
- Demosthenes** :—
 xlvii. (68), 141
- Diodorus** :—
 iii. (63), 94; iv. (56), 178, 182
- Dion Chrysostom** :—
Or. vii. (46, 75), 91
- Dionysius Periegetes** :—
 (31-33), 180
- Euripides** :—
Bacchae (277 ff.), 94
Cycl. (572), 94
H.F. (1397), 49
I.A. (541, 1175), 208
Or. (389), 209
Phoen. (516), 213
- Galen** :—
περί τροφῶν δυν., 96
- Hellanicus** :—
 (fr. 170), 84
- Herodotus** :—
 i. (59, 64), 80; ii. (18), 99; ii. (164), 84
 iv. (18), 180; iv. (37), 176; iv. (105), iv. (106), 180; iv. (179), 179; v. (40), 213; v. (66. 1), 1, 82; v. (71. 2), 7; ix. (73. 1), 135
- Hesiod** :—
Theog. (651), 25; (823), 149 f.
- Hippocrates** :—
Aph. vi. (46), 24
- Homer** :—
Iliad. i. (258), ii. (676), iv. (171), 148; vii. (171-180), 88; viii. (27), 149; x. (436), 147; x. (544), 146 f.; xi. (375), xi. (757), xiii. (476), 148; xiii. (512), 25; xiv. (394-7), 23; xvi. (119), 148; xvii. (368), 149; xix.

Homer—
 (76-8), 148; (647-), 26; (23); (248)
Homeric H.
 To Apollo (334), 1
 To Demeter (150 ff.)
 To Hermes (528 ff.)

I.G. :—
 I² (76), I² (1), II² (1)
Isaacs :—
Menec.
Isocrates :—
 xv. (166)

Juvenal :—
 xvi. (21)

Libanius :—
 iv. (p. 6)

Livy :—
 x. (43. 1)

Longus :—
 i. (10, 1)

Lucan :—
Phars. i.

Lucian :—
Dial. Mo.

Lucretius :—
 i. (834 ff. 50)

Lysias :—
 vi. (10), 135

Manilius :—
 i. (56), 50

Martial :—
 vi. (47. 1)

Origen :—
cont. Cels.
Orphic Argon. (460-98), 1143)

Ovid :—
Am. iii. (ex Ponto, Her. xi. (Met. v. (710), 9 Trist. v. (

Homer—continued :

- (76-84), 23 f. ; xx. (500), 146 ; xxii. (477), 148 ; xxiii. (180), 147 ; xxiii. (626-8), xxiii. (647-9), xxiv. (165), 25
Od. vii. (66 ff.), 147, 148 ; ix. (486), ix. (542), 26 ; xi. (550), 148 ; xi. (606), 147 ; xii. (2), 23 ; xvi. (4), 148 ; xvii. (411), 93 ; xviii. (248), xix. (325), 149 ; xxiv. (377), 23

Homeric Hymns :

- To Apollo :—
 (334), 146 ; (409 ff.), 23
 To Demeter :—
 (150 ff.), 8
 To Hermes :—
 (528 ff.), 25 f.

I.G. :—

- I² (76), 142 ; I² (91), 138 ; I² (115, l. 19), 138 ; I² (188, ll. 60-64), 77 ; II² (1183), 138 ; II² (1237), 2, 131 ff. ; II² (1237, 73 ff.), 1

Isaeus :—

- Menec.* (39), 20

Isocrates :—

- xv. (166), 160 ; xvi. (25), 82

Juvenal :—

- xvi. (21), 170

Libanius :—

- iv. (p. 626, l. 22), 93

Livy :—

- x. (43, 13), 100 ; *fp.* 38-48, 165-171, *passim*

Longus :—

- i. (10, 15, 19), ii. (3), iii. (24), 96

Lucan :—

- Phars.* i. (564-7), 190

Lucian :—

- Dial. Mort.* i. (1), 93

Lucretius :—

- i. (834 ff.), 31, 113 ; i. (861-6), 113 ; vi. (783), 50

Lysias :—

- vi. (10), 141 f. ; xii. (69), 81 ; xxiii. (2, 3), 135

Manilius :—

- i. (56), 50

Martial :—

- vi. (47, 1-2), 49 ; xii. (21, 10), 51

Origen :—

- cont. Cels.* vi. (70), 200

Orphic Argonautica :—

- (460-98), 172 ff. ; (729-56), 174 ff. ; (1038-1143), 177 ff.

Ovid :—

- Am.* iii. (4, 11-12), iii. (6, 87), 49
ex Ponto. ii. (7, 23), 50
Her. xi. (106), 49
Met. v. (336), x. (209), 50 ; xiii. (817-18), xv. (710), 91
Trist. v. (7, 33), 50

Pausanias :—

- ii. (31, 10), ii. (34), 181 ; iii. (26, 2, 3), 212

Petronius :—

- (3), 20 f.

Philochorus :—

- (fr. 94), 2

Pindar :—

- Nem.* i. (18), 157
Ol. ii. (68 ff.), 183
Pyth. vi. (43), 23 ; ix. (70), 156 ; ix. (79, 80), 162 ; ix. (87-91), 162 f. ; ix. (93), 163 ; ix. (94-6), 159

Plato :—

- Alc. I.* (121), 85
Charm. (158 A), 99
Critias (115A, 5-B4), 94 f.
Hipp. Mai. (282B), 54
Laws (757B, E), 87 ; (759D), 86 f. ; (844D-845D), 90 f. ; (845A, C), 92 ; (845E), (916C), (958D), 141
Protag. (329D), 31

Plautus :—

- Menaechmi* (494), 49
Mil. (22), 144
Truc. (889), 144

Pliny :—

- Ep.* vi. (20, 10), vi. (28, 1), 166

Plotinus :—

- i. (2, 3), 105 ; ii. (3, 18), 109 ; iii. (2, 2), 110 ; iii. (7, 11), 107 ; iv. (3, 10), iv. (4, 11), 108 ; iv. (7, 9), 106 ; v. (3, 8), 107 ; v. (3, 15), 198 ; v. (9, 2), 199 ; vi. (5, 8), vi. (7, 11), 107 ; vi. (9, 4), 199 ; vi. (9, 7), 203

Plutarch :—

- Kimón* (17), 6
Solon (87F), 94
Theseus (25) 11 ; (25, 1), 4 f. ; 9 ; (32, 1), 6

Pollux :—

- viii. (111), 1

Propertius :—

- i. (18, 21), 50

Quintilian :—

- v. (11, 4), 91 ; viii. (6, 29), 47 ; ix. (93), 19

Sallust :—

- Jug.* xliii. (1), 170

Seneca :—

- de Consol.* x. (4), 50
Ep. iv. (6), 47 ; vii. (10), 51 ; (xli), 203 ; xc. (43), 50
Phaedra (978-80), 50
Praef. N.Q. (13), 201

Simplicius :—

- phys.* (xxvii), 112 ; xxvii. (11), 31

Solon :—

- fr. 4 (ll. 9-12) [Diehl], 89

Sophocles :—

- Ant.* (88), 208
Electr. (444 f.), 212
Trach. (814), 139
 (fr. 442 N.), 212
 (fr. 548 P.), 182

Strabo:—

- i. (52), 177; v. (4. 2), 94; viii. (7. 1), 4 viii.
(373), 181; viii. (378), 173; xi. (495), 180;
xii. (548), 176, 177; (342), (370), (489),
148; (495), 179; (585), 148

Synesius:—

Epist. (147), 99

Synkellos:—

399. (21), 10

Tacitus:—

Hist. ii. (78), 212

Terence:—

Ad. (177), 49

Hec. (33), 144 f.

and pp. 151-155, *passim*

Theocritus:—

- i. (45-54), 90 ff.; i. (49), 205; ii. (38),
70; v. (112-13), 93; xi. (46), 91; xv. (30),
101

Theognis:—

(1217), 207

Theophrastus:—

H.P. viii. (4), 91

Thucydides:—

- i. (126. 8), 7; ii. (1. 2), ii. (15), 7; iii. (86),
52, 55; iii. (86. 1), 55; iii. (115. 4), 56; vi.
(13. 1), vi. (18. 6), 54; vi. (54. 6), 81

Tibullus:—

pp. 49-51 *passim*

Valerius Flaccus:—

Arg. ii. (629, 630), 174; viii. (207-11), 182

Valerius Maximus:—

v. (9. 2), 51

Virgil:—

ad vill. Sir., 67

- Aen.* i. (1-7), 188; i. (81), 187; i. (85, 86),
185; i. (123), 46; i. (127), i. (178), i. (333),
i. (613, 617), 185; i. (748-56), 191; ii. (212-
14), 187; ii. (225-31), 191; ii. (646), 187;
iii. (19-21), 189; iii. (658), 185; iv. (576),
187; v. (368), 144; vi. (14-27), 189; vi. (22),
vi. (45), 187; viii. (91-95), 189; viii. (452),
185; x. (198), 69; xii. (672-75), 189
Ecl. i. (70), 185; v. (5), 50; (ix.), 67; ix.
(56-65), 69; x. (75, 76), 50
Georg. ii. (426-32), iv. (401-4), 189

Xenophon:—

- Cyr.* i. (3. 12), 95; viii. (3. 41), 99; viii.
(4. 3), 95

Oecon. v. (20), 94; vii. (36), 95

Zonaras:—

1716 (1), 150

III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

ἀκράτιστον, 98 ff., 205 ff.

ἀριστον, 100

Βριμῶ, 23

ὑββάλλειν, 24

ὕβος, ὕβος, etc., 24

), 182

(85, 86),
i. (333),
; ii. (212-
46), 187;
iv. (576),
; vi. (22),
viii. (452).
89
67; ix.

99; viii.



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

D Iunii Iuuenalis Saturae

Editorum in usum edidit

A. E. HOVSMAN

Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

Originally published by Grant Richards, this edition of Juvenal's Satires has now been out of print for some years. The chief feature of this new edition is the preface; the new matter consists more in additions than in corrections.

A COMPANION TO GREEK STUDIES

Edited by LEONARD WHIBLEY

Fourth Edition, revised. With 201 Illustrations and 5 Maps. Royal 8vo. 25s. net.

In this edition, new articles have been written on Gems, Music, Money, and Metre, and other articles have been generally revised. Professor Gardner has rewritten the account of the archaic period in the article on Sculpture, and Mr Wace has prepared new tables of the Earliest History of the Aegean. Many new illustrations have been added.

DEIGMA

A FIRST GREEK BOOK. By Professors Walters and Conway, with the co-operation of Miss Constance I. Daniel, M.A. 4s. 6d.

SECOND AND REVISED EDITION. With a Summary of Accidence by R. B. Lattimer, M.A., which has been included to enable students of average ability to dispense with the use of a separate grammar. The chief objects of the authors are to bring the pupil as soon as possible to the stage of reading Greek authors; and therefore to present the most important uses in Syntax side by side with the most important part of Accidence; and to use the chief results of recent inquiry in Historical Grammar, so as to simplify and enliven the harder forms of Accidence and rules of Syntax by indicating briefly how they grew up.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1

Murray's Classical Atlas For Schools

Edited by G. B. Grundy, M.A., D.Litt.

Consisting of 83 Maps and Plans. Folio (14½ x 9½ ins.). The maps in this atlas have been most carefully prepared so as to accentuate all the chief names and natural features of the countries. In the new edition all the maps have been thoroughly revised and some new contours have been added.

SECOND EDITION. 9s. net.

A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK & ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M.A. 25s. net

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W.1

OXFORD BOOKS

THE ARCHITECT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

By

T. Rice Holmes. Vol. II. 12s. 6d. net

'... No more efficient and satisfactory contribution to Roman historical studies has been made in the present century. . . .'
—*Scotsman*.

THE REIGN OF TIBERIUS

By

F. B. Marsh. 15s. net

'... Much the most scholarly work on the subject in English. . . .'
—*Oxford Magazine*.

GREEK COINAGE

By

J. G. Milne. 6s. net

'... This is an admirably succinct and well-proportioned introduction to a many-sided subject. . . .'
—*Scotsman*.

HALF LINES AND REPETITIONS IN VIRGIL

By

John Sparrow. 10s. net

'... Mr. Sparrow's treatment of the subject is highly illuminating, and this volume, it may be hoped, is only the prelude to that larger and more mature interpretation of Virgil for which it proves his competence. . . .'
—*Times Literary Supplement*.

THE POEMS OF LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM

Translated into English Verse, printed *en face* with the Greek, with Notes and a long Introduction.

By

Edwyn Bevan. 10s. 6d. net

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY

PRESS

JK

